

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 455.—APRIL, 1918.

Art. 1.—ETON; THE OLD AND THE NEW. ✓

1. *History of Eton College, 1440-1910.* By Sir H. Maxwell Lyte. 4th Edition. Macmillan, 1911.
2. *Annals of the King's College of our Lady of Eton beside Windsor.* By Wasey Sterry. Methuen, 1898.
3. *A History of Eton College.* By Lionel Cust. Duckworth, 1899.
4. *Fasti Etonenses.* By A. C. Benson. Eton: Ingaltou Drake, 1899.
5. *Eton in the Forties.* By A. D. Coleridge. Bentley, 1898.
6. *Memories of Eton Sixty Years Ago.* By A. C. Ainger. Murray, 1917.
7. *Eton in the 'Seventies.* By the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge. Smith, Elder, 1902
8. *Eton in the Eighties.* By Eric Parker. Smith, Elder, 1909.
9. *Etoniana.* Nos I—XXI. By R. C. Austen Leigh. Spottiswoode, 1917.

And other works.

OF making many books there is no end, but neither the making nor the reading appears to be weariness when they deal with Eton. Lord Harcourt has lately presented the school with his collection of *Etoniana*; it ends at the date 1900 and contains more than 2000 volumes, of which, without counting the issues of school periodicals, no fewer than 565 come within the reign of Queen Victoria. Nor does the output slacken. Mr Ainger opportunely fills a gap by his '*Eton Sixty Years Ago*'; and there is no year since 1830 and few since 1810 not the subject of

one or other, if not several, of these writers. Naturally one finds a certain sameness in their tone and much repetition of their anecdotes. Sir H. Maxwell Lyte's *History*, now in its fourth edition, laid the excellent foundation; Mr Wasey Sterry and Mr Lionel Cust added some independent research; Mr R. C. Austen Leigh ('*Etoniana*,' Nos 1—xxi) still collects antiquarian details of minute accuracy. Others are more bent on rehearsing with relish their early escapades, and were evidently as desperate fellows as ever was Mr Robert Shallow before he became Justice of the Peace 'and Ratolorum too.' The remainder content themselves with thoughtfully reflecting their impressions of the scenes among which they passed their boyhood. It is true that among all these there is no tale so outstanding as '*Tom Brown*,' so brightly popular as '*David Blaize*,' so soft as '*Eric*,' so soaring as '*The Hill*,' so saucy as '*Stalky & Co.*,' so perverse as '*The Loom of Youth*.' The Eton books have for the most part a balance and a reticence characteristic of the place. The sleeve displays a deal of embroidery but not the heart. One has to go deeper for that.

There is, then, a difference to be found between the Eton type and others. In what does it consist? A guest at a country house once said: 'If there are two Eton men in the smoking-room I take my candle and go upstairs.' The remark cuts both ways. To go on 'yarning' of your schooldays may argue want of manners and consideration for others or some narrowness of outlook; but it also suggests the overmastering attraction of the theme. At the Front it is said to be noted that Old Etonians meet with an eagerness quite unlike that of others, and it would not be unfair to claim that the affection for Eton has few parallels. In the last century the liberal bounty of Old Harrovians was far greater and their cricket attendance not less devoted, but then the needs of Harrow were supposed to be more urgent. Perhaps a better test may be found in desertions. There is evidence that many boys are sent to Eton whose parents were prominent at other schools, but very few Etonians send their sons elsewhere except for pecuniary reasons. If this be so, it becomes a matter of some importance to examine the sources of such affection and to ask whether it is earned rightly and fairly or by over-indulgence.

How does Eton compare with other schools in results; and what are the Public Schools doing for our Fatherland in War and in Peace? We know they are the admiration and despair of other countries and often abused in this. Are they to be remodelled or preserved?

The answer, as regards war time, need not be difficult. There has been no more remarkable, no more convincing outcome of this war than the splendid efficiency of those two classes, the Public School officer and the ordinary private soldier. It is not only that each is so surprisingly good at his job, but that they work so well together, that as a whole the officers love their men and the men their officers. At a time when at home the relations of labour and capital are dangerously strained, the representatives of the same two classes are sharing privations and risking death together at the Front with a mutual loyalty and keen affection which has gone far towards the saving of England.

War, however, is not a normal state. There can be no doubt about the absolute need for the Public School officer in the army. What about peace? To decide whether the output of the Public School fails in peace would be a harder task. The limits of an article forbid a searching examination, yet lists of the heads of departments, religious and civil, furnish, no less than the army Commands, a *prima facie* verdict in its favour. The Navy we omit, of course, though not unrepresented in high command; it specialises at too early an age. Nor will we enumerate eminent ecclesiastics, statesmen, rulers of dependencies, permanent secretaries, legal authorities and the like, and then strike out those who have had no public school training, because, however convincing the result may appear, it will be really superficial, inasmuch as the Public School is the most obvious English method of education.

The mention of the viceroys of India suggests a test for our question. For that high office a remarkable succession of Etonians may be claimed. Yet since it is one that requires rank and fortune, and these do largely gravitate towards Eton, this test is also inconclusive. Therefore, without further labouring the point, we may at least be justified in claiming that Eton has well discharged its function in providing that 'there may

never be wanting a due supply of fit persons to serve God in Church and State,' or, as Mr Wasey Sterry puts it, 'to get the world's work done, to spread the blessings of the *pax Britannica* and the *imperium Britannicum* among the less fortunate nations of the earth, to cultivate that religion which consists in loving mercy, and doing justice, and walking humbly with our God.' A noble programme indeed; what we have to ask is whether the due supply is of as high merit and as ample as is warranted by the material furnished to the greatest school in the world.

'It is in her public schools and universities,' said George Canning, 'that the youth of England are, by a discipline which shallow judgments have sometimes attempted to undervalue, prepared for the duties of public life. In my conscience I believe that England would not be what she is without her system of public education, and that no other country can become what England is, without the advantage of such a system.'

By what steps had Eton reached its high position of the 19th century? They are too well known and described by too many writers to need detail here. It was planned and replanned by Henry VI after the model of Winchester as a religious foundation for a College of secular priests with clerks and choristers, a school for his boys and a retreat for his almsmen. He built and rebuilt the Chapel to be the choir of a huge church, and left it the most beautiful and dignified Chapel in Britain, the shell of it architecturally as much superior to King's College, Cambridge, and to Henry VII's Chapel, Westminster, as the internal fittings of it are inferior to both. St George's, Windsor, has, of course, far more magnificence and far more ingenuity of construction, but in severe purity of design the Eton stonework is, with the possible exception of vaulted Lancing, unsurpassed.

The lodgings for his priests and a schoolroom and chamber for his scholars claim also to be the Founder's work. More was prevented by the troubles and ruin of the saintly and sorrowful King. Surviving with difficulty the Yorkist attacks the Foundation maintained its rights till the Tudor peace. Of College Hall the stately fabric of stone stops abruptly at the top of the great

oriel window. The next course and the roughly built parapet are in brick; all the wars of the Roses had intervened. The provostship of Roger Lupton added to the cloister the exquisite west front and state rooms. This was in 1520. Then came the royal supremacy and Reformation. Henry VIII stripped the church of its ornaments, the inventory of which has just been recovered by the diligence of the learned Provost of King's. Under Edward VI suppression was threatened, and Protector Somerset intruded into the Provostship Sir Thomas Smith. '*Hoc fonte derivata clades.*' Sir Thomas was a married man—'*quidam laicus et conjugatus.*' It was his successor, Dr Bill, who wiped out the precious mural paintings, but it was Smith who cleared away the High Altar, abolished the Founder's festivals, and grabbed rooms from his neighbours to house his wife.

From that time there has been steady trespass on back-premises by claustral residents. It would appear from the plan that the lodgings, probably built for forty members of the College, now house three resident families, and that the Provost's Lodge, having extended a new suite to the north and annexed the election state-rooms, even intruded its kitchen into a portion of what was built by the Founder for his scholars. Thus Lady Smith secured her husband's company at dinner, and the High Table lost it. Of course a celibate clergy may be an objectionable adjunct to a school, though a large majority of the masters is now unmarried, but it must be owned that a married clergy is more expensive. We do not grudge Lady Savile the attractive house (1603) which bears her husband's name, but the addition of an upper storey for families (1750) to Cloisters cut off sun and air from a very beautiful court. Meanwhile Upper School had completed the quadrangle of Schoolyard (1680-90); and Provost Henry Godolphin had repaired hall and kitchen, and lined Chapel with fine oak wainscote, incongruous but handsome. About a century passed before the next great building era. This dates from 1840 and may be taken as beginning Victorian Eton.

These, then, were the chief epochs in the growth of the College buildings. They show the distinctive characters of 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th century styles. In the growth of the school there were epochs hardly

less distinct. The Oppidans, numbering many sons of Henry's courtiers, increased under such Headmasters as Thomas Aldrich (1515) or John Newborough (1690), whose pupil Sir Robert Walpole (K.S.), in his long tenure of office, made the nation wealthy and the school popular. Andrew Snape (1711-1720), Hoadley's adversary, attracted further attention and drove out Thomas Thackeray as Headmaster to Harrow. Then came a critical and uneasy time, till harmony was restored by the ability, fashion and wit of Dr Barnard (1754-1765), for Horace Walpole 'the Pitt of Masters,' for Dr Johnson 'the only man who did justice to my good breeding.' Some held him superior to Garrick, but Mrs Berkeley declared him to have 'a black heart' ('Etoniana,' xviii). Much had been owed to Provosts Savile, Wootton, Rouse, and Alles-tree, and much to the genial scholarship of Headmaster Goodall, to the cordiality of George III and William IV, and something to the stormy fame of Keate.

During all this time the oppidan boarding-houses were gradually becoming more closely connected with and recognised by the school. Extant bills of early Etonians show rough but adequate attention paid to the boys' wants. For the Collegers, on the contrary, it would seem that the Fellows could spare neither fit accommodation nor sufficient food. Clerks, choristers, conducts had been excluded from college buildings. Head and Lower masters were unsalaried. As the cloister lodgings were absorbed, so also were the College emoluments. It was the fashion of the times. In the days of non-resident bishops and pluralist parsons, and the deadness of the social conscience, it was the natural thing for the Fellows to divide among themselves the annual income of the estates—no very large sum after all: W. H. Roberts's average (1771-1783) was 124*l.* plus 221*l.* for 'fines,' or 345*l.* in all. Later, the fines increased under a bad system of leases. The commutation of fellowships in 1870 was 1000*l.* The Fellows did as a matter of course what everyone did; it would have been strange indeed for a colonel to forgo profit from his regiment or the army paymaster to carry none of the soldiers' pay to his own bank account. That William Pitt should not present himself to a sinecure office was surprising. No such surprise is recorded in Eton audits.

Meanwhile the scholars starved in squalor. Nor was there anything strange in that. The women and children of the poor slaved like dogs in harness underground, and the miseries of little chimney-sweeps and their like had not attracted general notice. Yet the awakening was at hand. In 1830 Lord Ashley was in Peel's cabinet; and Wesley, Howard, Wilberforce, Pitt had secured the great revival of the preceding century. Blake's 'Chimney Sweeper' is dated 1787, Mrs Barrett Browning's 'Cry of the Children' 1832. Once more, and not for the last time, the splendid tenacity of England had saved Europe from a world-tyranny, and the new morality reached Eton. In 1840. Hodgson, as Provost, drove up the Shooting Fields to take possession, with his often-quoted vow, 'Please God I will do something for those poor boys.' It was high time. 'Carter's Chamber is more beastly than ever,' wrote John Lonsdale in 1812. 'Cruel at times the suffering and wrong, and wild the profligacy,' said Edward Thring.\* 'The inmates of a workhouse or a gaol are better fed and lodged than the scholars of Eton.'† 'Fagging had become an organised system of brutality and cruelty. I was frequently kept up till one or two o'clock in the morning waiting on my masters at supper and undergoing every sort of bullying. The rioting, masquerading and drinking that took place in College can scarcely be credited.'‡ 'My master was a beast and a bully, and the reign of terrorism on certain occasions was a horror I shall never forget.'§ 'The lads underwent privations that might have broken down a cabin boy and would be thought inhuman if inflicted on a galley slave.'||

Yet from scenes like these came such men as Edward Balston, Edward Thring, Wharton Marriott, Henry Bradshaw, Sir Alfred Lyall, Henry Polehampton, F. St J. Thackeray, E. D. Stone, and the like. That is no apology for the badness, but it is proof that there were intervals of peace amid the abominations which catch the eye, and gentle spirits escaping the brutal tyranny

\* 'Parkin's Life,' i. 24. † 'Quarterly Journal of Education,' 1834.

‡ 'Old Colleger, 1824,' in Maxwell Lyte, p. 455.

§ Dr Okes, in 'Eton in the Forties,' A. D. Coleridge.

|| Sir Edward Creasy, 'Historical Account of Eton College.'

which seems (and no wonder) to dominate the records. Whether Tennyson's tale of the sow on Chamber roof be true or not, there is less doubt that a donkey was brought up to Long Chamber and took part in a burlesque. The late Harry Tarver, who entered at the age of six (c. 1830), remembered a baby—no less a person than Samuel Evans, afterwards Drawing Master—being kidnapped from the 'Beeves' nursery to spend a night with the revellers. He used also to tell how one night he woke up in Chamber and wondered to see the stars overhead; presently there entered the Provost in canonicals and some Fellows, and he heard the former say, 'God forgive me! I knew of this before.' The roof had given way and might have caused serious ruin. According to Mr Tarver, the windows were not glazed; and in bad weather they closed the shutters and worked darkling. But certainly, whether the glass survived or no, the windows had been glazed in 1746. It all sounds incredible to us, but, like the usurpation of the Fellows, it was very much the usual thing. Nor may we think there was no relief to it. It was not all horrible, if Sir John Byng, a young Oppidan, went up into Chamber voluntarily for the fun of being tossed in the blanket which scalped 'Taffy' Williams (Rowland), and if we get a glimpse of enthusiastic talk between boys 'pacing the greasy boards of Long Chamber till eleven at night, which opened my myopic mind and revealed to me such a hero as I have never known since.'

And the Masters? To generalise about them would be as fallacious as about the boys. Shelley's tutor was the stupidest, but he 'always stood up for the unpopular cause of the scholars.' Drury, Knapp, Cookesley, were very clever and fine scholars, but set too frisky an example for boys. On the other hand, Hawtreys with his literary elegance, Chapman, Abraham, Marriott were genuinely religious reformers. Edward Coleridge, and no doubt others, took pains in the preparation of their pupils separately for Confirmation. In fact, many different sorts were represented there, but one thing they had in common. Gladstone's mature judgment in 1897 is recorded by Dr A. C. Benson:

'The teaching may be narrow; in one point it was admirable, its rigid, inflexible, relentless accuracy. A boy might learn

something or, if he chose, nothing; but one thing he could not do—learn anything inaccurately.

With which we may compare what Huxley laid down, speaking as one of the new Governing Body in Hall on Founder's Day, 'I care not what subject is taught if only it be taught well.' The Masters' relations with the boys were no doubt far more distant than now; how could it be otherwise? The number of their pupils was much greater, the exercises more numerous, more difficult, and much longer; and at that date the relations between parents and sons were also different. Buckram was not the garb of schoolmasters only. Underneath it 'human nature,' to quote a well-known Eton sermon, 'was human nature still.' The buckram wore pretty thin when Drury and Knapp posted up with pupils to the Play, and, if scandal be true, were bailed out of the lock-up by the Chancellor's clerk. Kegan Paul, 'bodkin from time to time' in his Headmaster's carriage, must have been on terms easier than his seat. Praed was not too shy to work with Hawtrey for the 'Apis Matina' and the inception of the Boys' Library. Keate could meet at breakfast a boy fresh from his block; and over the hospitable sausages was Hawtrey's comment on the fox, 'Cunning fellow, he knew what he was about.' Arthur Coleridge gloats over the memory of delicious pies sent from his tutor's to the hungry scholar; and a few years later the good Abraham in a boy's room 'would stand leaning against a bureau and discourse at length in a thoroughly friendly way, disarming us of all fear of him as a Master, and manage dexterously to introduce topics of high interest so as to rivet our attention.'\*

The Chapel services and the religious teaching were for the most part deplorable; that was not unusual, except among the Evangelicals. The Oxford Movement was only beginning. Sermons are always among the readiest subjects for ridicule. The Fellows' sermons in a building of difficult acoustics were not spared and did not deserve much mercy; but even here it is best not to be too sweeping. Of Plumtre most fun is made in many of the books, yet Ralph Nevill † says:

\* 'Memoir of Hawtrey,' by F. St J. Thackeray, 1896.

† 'Floreat Etona,' p. 306.

'F. P. was an excellent man, learned, and of original thought, so that his sermons were interesting, while his peculiar style and delivery, always attractive, was often amusing. He was a great favourite with the boys.'

Some of these preachers we saw rather than heard in the fifties. It must be remembered that they were younger in the thirties, and that Church feeling was undergoing a great change. Some of Hawtrey's sermons and lectures are in print and win the approval of his biographer, himself no mean judge of sermons.

Thus far we have tried to glance at the growth of Eton and its general condition down to, say, 1840. We find a strange mixture of good and bad, high culture and ignorance, happiness and misery. This was not inconsistent with the social habits of the time, and did not prevent warm attachment to the place, so that, when Long Chamber was broken up, the scholars, even including A. D. Coleridge, whose condemnation has been among the severest, were furious at the desecration. If we may compare with this a sketch of what the school was at the end of the century, we shall have the best gauge of the progress made under the good Queen.

The turning-points were Hodgson's Provostship (from 1840), New Buildings (1844), Hawtrey's Headmastership to 1853, the Royal Commission (1861), new Governing Body (1869), E. Warre as Headmaster (1884), new Statutes (1871), purchase of Agar's Plough (1895). The Commission came in large measure from the newspaper attacks of Sir John Coleridge and J. M. Higgins. The evidence taken before it is an invaluable mine of facts and feelings, but the Statutes resulting from it are said to compare ill with the careful and accurate work of the Founder. The ecclesiastical character of the foundation suffered most. The presence of 'emeriti' of distinction may be venerable among young people and sometimes useful, but it is the fashion to abolish institutions rather than restore their original use and discipline, and so the old Fellowships were deleted. The new Statutes made no attempt to renew the eleemosynary character of the scholarships. It was thought better to raise the standard of competitive cleverness, rather than to make Eton accessible to poorer parents. There is much to be said

for a policy which, by enhancing the level of intelligence in College, affects indirectly all the school, but it is hardly in agreement with the present trend of educational reform. One would like Eton to have anticipated the movement for extending opportunities to the poor, and at the same time to have satisfied the Founder. Not less than seventy scholarships were prescribed; to have increased this number might have been politic in view of future jealousy. The necessary charges of a K.S. are now defrayed for him; but, as the position has become more enviable, so the competition of titled or wealthy families has increased the expenses of preparation at successful private schools and of the social habits of 'Tugger.' The injunction that the Eton livings were to be offered in rotation to senior assistants would have unloaded superannuated schoolmasters, whether fit or unfit, as parish priests in reluctant villages. This also has now been rightly amended by the action of the new Fellows. The government of the school was removed from the Provost assisted by the Fellows in consultation with the Headmaster assisted by the Lower master; it was now (1869) given to a committee of ten, appointed by various institutions or officers of high position. The Provost is Chairman; one member represents the Headmaster and his staff, and a Vice-provost is appointed annually.

Government by Committee—a very fashionable solution—is open to a few obvious objections. Some members may do harm, knowing nothing of the school and its ways, some by too fussily pressing their special fancies. Meetings are difficult for busy non-residents; and of course the busiest men were likely to be appointed. Yet an infusion of new blood often works a cure, though, as Mr Jowett suggested to an emphatic lady, 'the operation is sometimes attended with fatal consequences.' If the old Provost and Fellows were likely to be obstructive, yet a vigorous Headmaster might find a Governing Body difficult from want of acquaintance with school detail. One would say that the Headmaster's responsibility ought to be held paramount and the Staff to have more distinct representation.

The new experiment in government did not at once approve itself. The Drill Hall and School of Mechanics were not happy architectural efforts; the

organ screen was built without sufficient reference to the coming organ; the treatment of the old Sun public house, in spite of local protest, was disheartening. But the strangest episode was the planning of College sick-rooms, for which Hawtrey's Library, a beautiful and historic room, was destroyed without provision of a substitute. The Precentor was therefore moved from his newly fitted house and the books piled on the vacant floors; this proving unsuitable, the new drawing-school was taken, and a newer drawing-school had to be provided by destroying Stephen Hawtrey's Mathematical rooms and Museum, and building for these the Queen's Schools, a not very engaging work by Sir A. Blomfield. Finally, after these displacements, the rooms used for the Boys' Library in New Schools were condemned and the books moved to the Memorial Buildings. All this could hardly have happened at the hands of a committee alert, on the spot, and acquainted with the needs and habits of the place.

In 1895 the vitally important acquisition of Agar's Plough was hastened by the generosity of a few Old Etonians. They saw the deadly approach of Slough suburbs, and, having for years urged timely prevention, forced the then bursarial hand by promptly buying and presenting a strip already advertised for speculative building on the west frontage of Slough road. This statesmanlike generosity, in which Mr J. P. Carter and Mr A. C. Cole were foremost, led to the acquisition of all the land between Eton and Slough. Nearly all the southern meadows being Lammas, the school has thus been saved from strangulation, but the cost must have been much increased by the delay.

These beginnings boded ill for the new system. But new 'Fellows,' fit and loyal, are now in power. Their title is honorary, and their work (unpaid) is given with zeal and discretion. Much is owed to men like the late Earl of Morley and those who at present are working to issues which have won and will retain the grateful confidence of the governed. Some decisions may be open to criticism by the outsider, such as the small temporary increase of numbers to enable House Masters to fulfil their too numerous engagements in war time, or the arrangement for a general 'Long leave' once a half

which entails a dangerous and expensive gathering in London; but for the most part details seem rightly left to the Headmaster. It was sound doctrine that was once pronounced at a Masters' meeting by one who said, 'The business of the Governing Body is to appoint the best Headmaster and when appointed to leave him alone'; and no one present can forget the shudder that went round when he added to Dr Hornby in the chair, 'In your case, sir, they have done neither.' Then he went on, 'for they did not appoint you and have not left you alone.' Each statement was true. Dr Hornby had been appointed by the College one year before the new regulations.

These are the principal events in the history of Victorian Eton. It remains to see how its present state compares with what has been said of its past. We saw that in Gladstone's time 'a boy need not learn unless he chose.' In these days that is simply untrue. There has been a steady increase of work throughout the school. Dr Warre's access to power came like a wind from the sea to invigorate every department and to raise for each the standard of industry. Indeed, as there is sometimes a fear of younger boys being overtaxed, their winter hours had to be rearranged to give more daylight relaxation and more sleep. Nowadays a persistently idle boy 'leads a very frampold life.'

Whether intellectual vigour and interest have increased equally with the compulsory work, it would be difficult to discuss within the limits of an article. There is much to indicate that the widening of the curriculum has fostered the spread of knowledge and intelligence rather than depth and thoroughness. 'Softer options' may weaken, and the greater number of subjects may overcrowd, mental application, so that on the whole our judgment would be that there is now more cleverness and versatility, but not always more penetration, not more private study. The specialists of the upper forms, more alert-minded, better informed and far better taught, yet seem to have rather less tenacity and grounding. For instance, the magazines which the literary sets issue from time to time, indicate increased reliance on older contributors, and by advertisement of perhaps reluctant

tradesmen a desire for profit as well as for self-expression. The 'Chronicle' professes to record carefully only the games, but it prints fanciful leaders in very clever journalese, which might be devoted to subjects of interest to the school if such there were. Nevertheless this widening of the curriculum, this abolition of the monopoly of classics has been achieved as the public demanded; and, if there be less thoroughness, there is vastly wider interest and industry.

'It is character, however, not intellect, which succeeds in this world and inherits eternity.' Is character weakened by the widening of the curriculum? No one can think this in the face of facts from the scene of war. There, cheerful heroism and devoted self-sacrifice have consecrated the friendships, the communing with high things, the love of truth and beauty which shine out in our letters and records. There may have been danger lest the growing influence of convention at school should stunt individuality; and it has often been said that the public school can turn out only one pattern, as the sea wears down the beach pebbles to their monotonous round. The danger is real; and 'it's not done' or 'one has to do it' is far more a rule of modern schoolboy life than it used to be. Let us hope that it is only the jagged edges that are smoothed; certainly there has been hitherto no lack of surviving individuality. Those who remember a Fifth Form boy self-taught to translate for the first time into European language a Coptic deutero-apocryphal text can also record in more recent years a boy no higher in the school busy with hieroglyphics, or another teaching himself Pali to translate a new Kam-mavarca. An R.A.K. may be compared with a J.K.S. The young authors of the 'Rambler,' 'Parachute,' 'Adventurer' worthily carried on the traditions of Canning, Frere and Moultrie. If Swinburne and the Laureate be of the older *régime*, verse is still written by the young. Great promise has been cut short by war. Among musicians J. S. K. Butterworth was a scholar and R. S. Kelly also doubled his aquatic fame with music, as another Captain of the Boats unites airmanship and languages with painting. Sir Hubert Parry was keeper of the Field. Eton artists contribute to the best exhibitions, though (as in the case of the Lord Chancellorship) they are to seek in the

highest honours of art. What lack of force and variety is there in the records of the Grenfells or Charles Lister? Quintin Hogg, C. T. Studd, Father Adderley, Shane Leslie are not conventional figures. A witty militant humanitarian and an obstinate conscientious objector have not been moulded to one shape. In ornithology, mathematics, biology there are distinguished Eton names; and one of the best isolators of paratyphoid germs is an O.E. The leaders of the Church Union and of the Christian Social Union differ from each other as well as from Chinese Evangelists like Mr Polhill. Actors from Charles Kean to Mr Bouchier have been Eton boys. Mr Balfour and the Cecils have other characteristics than merely political, and no one will dispute the independence of Sir Horace Plunkett. It would be invidious as well as tiresome to prolong a list of O.E. commoners when the only object is to prove that this public-school training need not destroy individuality.

Still it is not to be denied that absorption in athletics has been exaggerated with, if not by, the modern elaboration of 'colours'; and this in some measure draws off attention from more important things. Those who remember the delight of listening to Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Frederick Myers, and others, regret that nowadays, unless as a substitute for schoolwork, men of light and leading do not draw a worthy audience. Drawing, music, natural history, once hobbies, are now schoolwork. Photography holds its own, and the study of motors and air machines is eager; patriotism makes itself felt, but the O.T.C. and Summer Camp must be fortified by some remission. A good deal of agricultural work has been done by Eton boys—potato and allotment digging and the like; and if it can hardly be said that this school gave the lead to others, still the proposals for holiday farm-camps were rightly and wisely declined, since health and discipline are more difficult when the numbers are so great. It might be feasible, however, to set free for soldiering groundmen and the like if the preparation for games were undertaken by boys. The masters by their presence make friends and add vigour and skill, but seem to sanction a cult of games. Their scanty leisure is taxed by coaching house-teams and helping novices—at what expense of midnight oil remains unguessed.

If we deprecate an excess we do not speak lightly of the games. Like fire, they are good servants, bad masters, indispensable for training of body and enjoyment of action, invaluable for teaching chivalry, good temper, endurance, most useful for keeping minds and tongues wholesomely occupied. Yet they usurp too prominent a place in the talk and thought of grown-up English folk. Cricket has become a campaign, and play for three days on end, with a lot of sitting-out, presupposes a class more leisured and wealthy than is likely to survive. Fives and football give the maximum of exercise in the minimum of time, and the activity of the one and the daring of the other are the ideal of open air training. 'It was better than Collegers and Oppidans,' said a young captain in the Rifles after a desperate scrimmage in a German trench. It was said of another from the Coldstreams going to his last assault, 'he had on his College wall colours, the symbol to him of all that is noble and boyish and aspiring.' It is certain that sharing in the games at home has helped to weld the union of classes at the war. Nevertheless, it is likely that necessity will curtail, perhaps even dangerously, the English devotion to sports. Will the Eton beagles continue in favour with the farmers? We doubt it; but, if they do, we wish a hint might be taken from Mr Brinsley Richards' 'Seven Years at Eton,' 'the run used to be far better when a cad was sent out with a drag' (p. 63). Pleasure in killing is repugnant to right training for the young, especially when the quarry is so appealing an animal as the hare. Even such high-spirited and popular Etonians as the clever authors of 'Seven Summers' have felt this form of sport to be cruel. The care of hounds is a thoroughly wholesome and delightful interest for the keeper and his whips, without the extravagance of elaborate uniforms and fresh outlay to imitate a grown-up establishment.

If socialist democracy insists on curtailing sport we must learn adventure, daring and skill not in killing but in taming animals, breaking-in horses, studying and making friends with the woodland, tilling the links, planting and felling the forest, and, above all, riding 'the sea with hempen bridle and horse of tree.' No dank and costly racquet court can compare with the open air

and the salt water; and the sky itself will be our playing fields. Whatever the future may bring we think the athletic side of school life overdone. Victorians were as good athletes without the expensive paraphernalia now anticipated by private schools also, and even creeping into the imitative secondary schools of the counties. What should be an amusement for the young tends to become an obsession with grown-ups. Too often they talk as if athletic distinction were the object of their sons' school life. Meanwhile some young cricketers show symptoms of boredom; and if some wetbobs find their training too long and too exclusive, some parents begin to think the outlay excessive. Whether 'Lord's' will revive after the war, who can say? In any case, the increasing expense of matches with other schools at other seasons of the year needs watching. It will be well on this point to listen to what Mr Ainger has to say in 'Eton Sixty Years Ago' about the extravagance of Henley; and indeed, as that is the only book on our Eton shelf written by a past master who knows the life both from the inside and the outside, all his suggestions should be of great value. We only wish that they had gone rather deeper below the surface.

After the intellectual and athletic changes comes the moral and religious life of the school, a subject to be approached with much diffidence, although far the most important of all. But is an estimate worth attempting, since hardly any two masters, hardly any two boys, would agree in judgment? Two boys may go through a school side by side, and one will see all the evil and the other be unconscious of anything but the good. A master may live in the fool's paradise of a bad house, or may be hardly aware of the lasting good owed to the courage and high ideals of a few boys under his roof. Yet, if the sympathy and watchful tact of the tutor works along with and through lads of that mettle, then you have the best possible conditions that any school anywhere can ever offer. Add to this the sharper wits, greater independence and more ancient traditions of College, and you would count it 'ne plus ultra' did you not know what grace and attraction may grow in a good tutor's Oppidan house. There can be no

doubt that the tutors have relations with their houses far closer and more confidential than of old, and that they are much more alert, much more helpful, on moral questions. On the spiritual side Church influences are perhaps weakened by the removal of denominational restrictions and the reluctance of teachers to take Holy Orders, but they are greatly reinforced by the increasing reverence of chapel services. The use of the term 'Chapel,' which has displaced the word 'Church,' is significant, as all such changes must be if one knows the cause. This marks the extrusion of the townfolk from Weaver's benches in the antechapel and the separation of the parish from the school. Most notable is the contrast of the services in Chapel now and in the last century. It is indeed comely and reviving both in College and Lower Chapels. Although in the former the seating is overcrowded and in some places still indecorous; yet greater care is constantly being given to win reverence and regard.

That the Church Catechism is no longer clumsily obtruded in Lent would be pure gain if one were sure that it received due attention elsewhere, but there may be a fear lest in some pupil rooms the opportunity of definite religious teaching on Sunday be encroached on by art, civics, or literature. A more serious loss would be the preparation for Confirmation if given over to less intimate deputies; no chance of access and influence can be nearly so valuable as this; and, though insincerity would be far worse, it must be a great act of self-denial for a tutor to forgo it. No doubt now, as of old, there are religious sympathies among certain groups of boys either meeting for Bible reading or for services at neighbouring churches, but they attract no notice and it is not meet to enquire. If there is ever a tinge of sceptical paradox among some older scholars it is only a boyish affectation of cleverness. At all events the brutality and aggressiveness of the coarser sets has practically disappeared. Civility at home and the vast improvement of preparatory schools have helped to clear the darker corners. Nearly all the best preachers in the country are now heard in Chapel by an attentive audience, but a stranger is often at a disadvantage in addressing a congregation so mixed and so little known. The addresses of Dr

Lyttelton were not less effective than keen; and his successor is unsurpassed as a preacher to boys. While the care and reverence in the conduct of services steadily increases, some critics are ill content with the cathedral form; but, judiciously curtailed by the extra-diocesan independence of the Foundation, it still remains the most English of all types and safest from either extreme. We hope it will be faithfully maintained. Great pains are taken with the music, and the cooperation of the boys is encouraged. The more frequent opportunities of Holy Communion and the voluntary attendance at Intercession Services encourage the hope that with so much naturalness and simplicity there is also a true spirit of devotion. It is noted by Mr Lionel Cust that with the relaxation of ecclesiastical restrictions has come more, not less, genuine religious feeling.

We have now made some comparison of the athletic, the intellectual and the moral life of the school before and after the 19th century. It remains to attempt an estimate of the causes of its acknowledged preeminence, apart from the peaceful beauty of the place, the charm of its surroundings and traditions, the splendour of its equipment, and its dedication by the Founder.

The Eton system rests largely on a vague law of liberty and on three, or perhaps more, definite arrangements. These are, separate rooms for the boys, the tutorial relation, and the position of the Headmaster. The first, though considerably more expensive in building and service, by allowing privacy makes for development of character. Where boys are herded together and kept perpetually employed, there is not the same chance for the private grace of individuality. The dormitory may be safer for morals and safer for health while it is clean and uninfected, but, if a breakdown does occur, there is infinitely worse mischief than where private rooms afford isolation for invalids and *'mollia tempora fandi'* to an anxious or encouraging tutor.

Of the Tutorial system the gist is this. From entrance to leaving the boy should be attached to the supervision of one master *'in loco parentis.'* The tutor and the new boy, working together many hours daily, get to know each other pretty thoroughly, and, if each be a good sort,

they become real friends. Then, all through the school, the tutor would supervise his pupil's work and have charge of his literary and religious training. This was one advantage of the classical curriculum. When specialising came in, the boy had to be transferred to a new teacher. In such cases the tutor no longer sees so much of his work nor watches so closely his development. Thereby one of the bulwarks of the system is weakened. This cannot be helped; it is impossible in the face of modern requirements and new legislation to maintain the old curriculum. What we hope is that width and variety will compensate, and that those who continue their classical work will be less hampered and more proficient as well as wider than before. Still there are who believe that no modern instrument of education rivals the Classics for efficacy, convenience or economy, and that therefore the great endowed schools should remain fortresses of the Humanities, with every encouragement for the pursuit of other voluntary studies in the time saved from excessive athletics. But this presupposes a love of learning not yet frequent in this country. It is part of the office of schools to implant it.

Another peculiarity of Eton should be noted—the tutor's reports. It is and was the custom to write to the parent every holidays a careful letter—not a table of marks and school order, but a thoughtful analysis of character and progress showing much insight and study. The value to the parent can hardly be overestimated; it draws together parent, pupil and tutor, and, though a laborious task, is well worth the sacrifice of the first few days of the holidays. For a specialist, of course, its value is impaired because the tutor knows less about him. The problem is how to retain the old intimacy in the face of modern requirements. Again, the old plan of employing as masters none but old Collegers, though perilously narrow, did secure a tradition of unity and attachment which had much to do with the strong affection of most Etonians for their school. When masters are so many and so often quite new to the place there is danger to this *ἡθός*: at present, as we have noted, Old Etonians when they meet are said to surpass all others in cordiality. There is an incredible crowd of salutations and festivals

to celebrate the Fourth of June and even Founder's Day all over the world. We do insist on this testimony and on the great value of this affection. It arises from happiness and a reverence for which no scientific improvement would be compensation. What we want is to get the latter without risk to the former.

Finally, the Headmaster at Eton is not saddled with a boarding-house. His relations with both boys and masters are impartial, his pecuniary position fairly assured, and he has time for governing his kingdom and also keeping in touch with the public life of the country. Mr Clutton Brock in an excellent handbook ('Eton'; Bell, 1900) rightly urges the limitation of the excessive numbers of the school, but would wrongly measure it by the possible extent of the Headmaster's acquaintance with the individual. The numbers should be limited, but the space in Chapels and the accommodation of the boarding-houses and school-rooms seem more to the point than the Headmaster's knowing all the boys. A bishop should rule his diocese through archdeacons and incumbents, a vice-chancellor his university through heads of houses or senate, a viceroy his realm through council and officers. To know every boy may be right for what is called the Arnold tradition; it is outgrown at Eton and neither possible nor particularly useful. The influence of Dr Warre and Dr Lyttelton has been, and that of Dr Alington will be, very great, but the Headmaster's government should not come between the tutor and his pupil or between the parent and the boy, but should be exercised through the house-masters, his assistants, the sixth form of his division, and the house captains, or by edict from school office, or by his use of the pulpit. This position of the Headmaster—his independence of boarders and his relation to the tutors and the boys—is a palladium of the school.

So much for the more peculiar features of the system which has made Eton what it is. It is certain, however, that much less depends on system than on the men who work it. The boys, we said, are much better taught now than fifty years ago. Well-furnished critics like Dr A. C. Benson have insisted that far too many left Eton ignorant of Physics and Mathematics, unable to

read Latin or Greek, and with no power of self-expression, no pleasure in literature. It was too true. It can hardly be true now. Changes of curriculum, of course, leave loopholes and it must take years to fit the modern requirements into a twenty-four hour day, yet the edifice is being built up and new modifications ever introduced. Some impenetrable Philistines there will always be from idle and fashionable homes; and indeed it may be doubted whether in our leisured classes there has been any great advance in intellectual interest. Take the railway book-stall and compare the proportion of tawdry ephemerals to standard works. Look at the suggestive covers of blatant magazines. Take the theatre whence plays are ousted by *revue* and *revue* by cinema; smudged pictures prevail over letterpress in many newspapers. Rapidity of change attracts, and everything must be fast and loud and easy. Intellectual effort is to be avoided. The reprints of English classics are for a different public, and it is the workman that begins to care for education. In the face of this tendency it is not to every home that we can look, for extending to the schoolboy a serious pleasure in learning.

More depends on the home, but at school one help might be the training of the teachers, although sometimes it has been said that trained nurses lose humanity. In teachers humanity is far more important even than skill, but we see with pleasure that in his able 'Defence of Classical Education' so good an advocate as Mr R. W. Livingstone urges the need of training for Public School teachers. We have heard some of the staunchest Old Etonians contrast the difference between our material and that for secondary teachers in the County Schools. They point to the ability and success of the latter, and think it strange that no Headmaster at Eton has yet required his young assistants to come to him trained for their work. Some of these have had experience of other school methods or foreign travel; others have not, and learn their business by rule of thumb not without difficulty and failures. Yet it is on the quality of the staff that nearly everything depends. The appointments and the control remain the Headmaster's most important function. The worst harm done to any school is to allow the rise or continuance of a 'bad house.' Removal

is rare, dismissal a dreadful responsibility. But that is why Headmasters are carefully chosen and highly paid. This most formidable of duties is further embarrassed nowadays by the difficulty of bringing the best men into this rather than into more lucrative or more brilliant professions. The consequence is well put by Mr Ainger. Again, the newer type of boarding-house requires an establishment and style of living even in time of peace quite beyond the '*mundus victus non deficiente crumena*,' which ought to set the example of 'plain living and high thinking' to a rising generation.

As regards the social life of the boys there is the most absolute appearance of their general happiness (and what a value is a happy boyhood!) and their love of the place. Fagging and bullying are no longer any trouble. Sometimes, in cleverer circles, an eccentric is worried by pin-pricks of chaff or by want of friends. Shelley's trials, though real, were partly self-invited and have been grossly exaggerated. Swinburne, less provocative, had by no means a bad time. And now few things are more cheering than the contentment and pleasure of the new boy in his big little world.

Some things might be amended, for instance the vexatious habit of those who can fag, obliging every lower boy at every call to leave his work and race to the caller. The maintenance of a custom so vexatious and wasteful helps one to understand how it was that 'Shirking' went on so long; yet it is possible for the same person to marvel at the latter and maintain the former. Perhaps the history of 'Shirking' has some interest as a Victorian relic. It was originally a point of monkish or Spanish etiquette to show respect by not appearing in the presence of the greater man. It still continued after it had lost all remains of common sense, and it became not only a nuisance to boys and masters alike but a sort of education in falsehood and humbug. Nowadays a decent salute is the most that is expected even from a private soldier to his officer, though he is still forbidden to address the latter except through a N.C.O. A stranger sometimes asks whether the movement of a schoolboy's finger would satisfy Wilhelm Meister's requirements of reverence. It is significant that the abolition of 'Shirking,' attributed by some to Dr Goodford, by

others to Dr Hornby, was really due to the most conservative of Headmasters, Dr Balston.

Some young Belgians lately conducted round the school by an Old Etonian were amazed at three marvels—the absence of any ‘bounds’ (not quite true), the absence of a chair for their prince in his division (he sat on a form like the rest!), and the power apparently entrusted to the upper boys. This last raises one of the most difficult questions of statesmanship. The authority of the Oppidan Sixth Form has been allowed to decay, partly by the system of promotion introducing into it too many boys of little personal influence; partly by the absorption in games exaggerating the influence of leading athletes often, but not always, more vigorous in character; and thirdly, while in College the ten Sixth Form boys retain all their old power over the sixty below them, the number of Oppidan Sixth Form remains the same (ten) out of all proportion to the increase of that part of the school. Therefore, since Dr Warre always disclaimed a monitorial system, ‘Pop’ with the leading athletes outbalanced Sixth Form. This must account for much of the inferior position taken by learning in the eyes of the younger boys. It appears to them not unnaturally to be the official appraisalment. Many opportunities of readjustment have been lost, not for want of suggestion. Now, when the school is denuded by the elder boys hurrying away to arms, it becomes a still more important object, which needs to be kept in view with much pondering of methods and possibilities. At present the position is unsatisfactory in two ways. There is nowhere any sufficiently recognised responsibility, and the control is apt to be inconstant and inefficient, while in the members of ‘Pop’ the privilege breeds an unwholesome self-consciousness with childish affectations or extravagances of dress and bearing.

There is a passage in Dr Edward Lyttelton’s sketch of his brother Alfred at school which bears weightily on this subject, when he describes Alfred’s attitude towards evil from 1872 onward under Dr Hornby:

‘There was much rottenness in the school during the ensuing years. . . . Alfred very rarely reprovved rascality. . . . In the midstream of boy life, exposed to all its various elements,

some at that time poisonous, some barbarous, some splendidly healthy, there was a dominating manliness about him which did not exactly rebuke vice, but banished it and all diseased talk about it from his company.' Hence 'his influence on the tone of the school was extraordinarily wholesome.' But it was a passive influence. 'He would associate with the baser sort when it was needful, but never scolded them or exhorted them to higher things. . . . It is worth considering whether he would have been so popular if he had been more of a crusader. Probably not. It is not easy for boys at school to be aggressive against rascality without making serious blunders, and at that time there was such an acquiescence in low conduct and talk that popular opinion would never have condoned any slip in a reformer.'

This sketch of the leading boy in the school by the distinguished brother who shared his room, is full of suggestive warning, besides being of great interest to those who knew and admired the most lovable of our statesmen. Others who were then watching the future Headmaster knew that his bolder opposition to evil gave presage of his work in Holy Orders, and that he sacrificed much popularity by his more uncompromising attitude. In some houses it was needed. Compare Mr Murray's 'More than the average share of this taint prevailed at my tutor's,' and 'I tried to work, but a small boy sap often had a bad time of it at my tutor's.\*' Would 'public opinion' have been so ready to side with 'beast or blackguardly set' if a boy like Edward Lyttelton had been backed by or associated with a set of leaders brought together by something other than athletics and fashion, however admirable and devoted the best of these have been? Alfred at Eton glowed, as it were, with adolescent gaiety. It was not virility, for he was youth personified. The growth and sunny ripening of that character has lately been so described that hearts are won by the '*veluti descripta tabella Vita*'—alas! not '*senis*,' would it were! Nor less is the versatile charm of George Wyndham expressed in his own selected letters. Though memories of our heroic friends, good, brilliant, dear as they, fallen in these three dreadful years, crowd on our memories now, forms as radiant, faces as winning, prowess and promise

---

\* 'Eton Sixty Years Ago.'

as great, yet even so what student of Victorian Eton will not ask to lay one flower on those graves while he heaps the rest with laurels?

Lastly, a word on the Eton buildings. We have shown that they were in the styles of four successive centuries from Chapel to College Library. What, then, is meant when people talk of the 'style of Eton'? The style of Eton is not exclusively gothic or classic, stone or brick. The style of Eton is strict and dignified reserve, 'leying a parte superfluite of to grete curiouse werkes of entaille and besy moldyng.' The valid criticism of the 'Memorial Buildings' is not that they carry forward the English style of later Wren from the earlier Wren of Upper School across the road, but that gross unnecessary ornament overloads the simple lines of the main masses. The sides and back of the Hall, the Vestibule, the curve of the dome, and the interior plan of the Library—one of the most beautiful rooms in the country—show how much dignity has been obscured by lavish or unstructural decoration. For any future memorial this lesson is not lightly to be forgotten. But for those who pin their faith to one exclusive style there is a useful warning ready to hand. It is not generally known that it was once proposed to bring Upper School into harmony with the 'Eton Style,' and an appalling architectural elevation in College Library shows all that western front of College transfigured with the crockets and pinnacles and pointed arches of pretentiously feeble gothic. Let it be laid down that an artist can only worthily express himself in the style which his country, his period, or his genius has made natural to him. For the more ancient buildings we believe that since the egregious routing of Lord Grimthorpe's assault on Savile House, due care is now assured. It is in picking at petty details that the danger lurks, and it is true that a protest from all the Old Etonians of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments was treated as negligible so lately as in 1912 by a majority of the new Fellows of Eton. A Headmaster whose first reform was to vindicate the Founder's school-room from its disgraceful indignities is not likely to be wanting in reverence for the rest. In all such matters history must be the criterion, not the 'taste' of this or

that amateur. Many passages in the books on Eton show how amusingly unreliable that taste may be. Take, for example, College Chapel after the Wilder 'Restoration':

'It is a rare specimen of Church architecture and embellishment; its side windows, no less than sixteen in number, have been decorated with stained glass of the highest order—and it may now be truly said to contain a most perfect and interesting collection of such art' (Ralph Nevill, 'Floreat Etona,' p. 305).

And this was the verdict of a late monarch. But, says Mr Clutton Brock (p. 150), the restoration of the Chapel 'was most of it money wasted. The windows in particular are unsurpassed in ugliness and would entirely destroy the beauty of any less beautiful building.' Yet, if we prize and preserve our buildings as they deserve, what a pity it is that numbers of boys leave without ever seeing the state rooms of the cloisters and the incomparable portraits of the Lodge! To fix a time when members of the school might have access without the sense of intrusion would be a privilege adding new reverence to all memories, and a fresh pride in the splendid endowment of what Mr Gladstone called, not the 'cream,' as in Mr G. Coleridge's report, but the 'Queen of all the schools of all the world.'

To sum up, the typical England of our day has been apt to care more for the body than the mind, more for sports than for intellectual pursuits, more for social efficiency than for high endeavour. This has been true, and it is a pity, for the two ideals are not mutually exclusive. In so representative a school as Eton there cannot but be some reflexion of the national temper. It would be disgraceful that any boy should spend five years in any school and leave without any sound knowledge or any habit of effective application, or any reverence or love for learning. We believe that to be no longer true of Eton. There is good work done throughout the school. The younger boys seem invariably happy, and elder boys get not only wider teaching, but a social experience which should have the friendships and enthusiasms of University life without idleness or rowdyism. But the terrible stress of war and the prospects of the future warn the British not to be content

until the utmost use is made of all our resources. The intelligence of the gentry can no more be allowed to lie fallow than their lands. At last we are going—as Mr Lowe advised—to ‘educate our masters’; and they perhaps will not tolerate an idle upper class living for sport and pleasure, nor will that class itself desire it.

We have to hold on to these ideals, also remembering that there are other qualities which it would be deplorable to lose. Nothing can replace the spirit which Eton engenders, a spirit shown in the following extract from a letter just received, and almost too intimately sacred to print, yet too precious to omit as evidence of what the public schools are now giving us. They are the words of one who, born an American, and trained at Harvard, would be no mean or partial judge of what goes to make a man :

‘A week ago we did a big attack, and he was one of those who lived to reach the objective. It was as he wished it to be—he told me himself—in the very front line of the attack, carrying on. He was very eager. He went in as he told me some weeks ago he was going to do—as if it were the greatest game in the world, and he was playing for Eton. The night before we went in we read the King’s speech from “Henry V” —“and gentlemen in England now abed.” But he didn’t need to read it; he’s inspired like that all the time—Eton and England have lost one of their staunchest and most loving sons—the keenest Etonian I’ve ever known. I verily believe that it was the thought of Eton more than of family or England that inspired all his work out here. L. G., who was at Mr Lubbock’s, is another. I knew him almost better than L. L. Do you wonder that I adore Eton when such nobleness and strength, gentleness, sweetness and purity is in the hearts of those whom she sends forth? My love and thanks to Eton for having given me such friends.’

H. E. LUXMOORE.

## Art. 2.—BELGIUM AND LUXEMBURG, 1831—1839. ✓

ONE of the most serious difficulties, perhaps the most serious of all those encountered in the establishment of the Belgian kingdom in 1831, was the settlement of its frontiers; they were to be fixed according to the part to be played by the new State in the European system. The feelings of the London Conference with regard to the Belgian nation varied with the course of events. Its principal task was, in the view of most of the members of the Conference, to preserve so far as possible the results achieved by the Congress of Vienna, i.e. to keep a powerful barrier against France, and for that purpose to combine the military system of Belgium with that of Holland. This territorial question, therefore, was a European problem. In its wish to remain literally faithful to the decisions of the Congress of Vienna, the London Conference was led to rob Belgium of its most extensive province, which had served as its bulwark against Germany ever since the Belgian principalities had been united under the Dukes of Burgundy. The Duchy of Luxemburg contained the greater part of the large wooded table-land of the Ardennes and a stronghold of the highest strategic value, the fortress of Luxemburg, which commands the road leading from Trèves to Longwy and Verdun. It had been especially coveted by Louis XIV, who conquered it in 1681, but had to restore it at the Peace of Rijswijk in 1697. From that time, it remained one of the most important fortresses of Belgium and one of the bases of its defensive system.

The Congress of Vienna, however, gave it a new international status in 1815. It agreed to a proposal of Hans von Gagern, the spokesman of the dynasty of Nassau, to turn that province into a Grand Duchy in exchange for a much less extensive and less populous territory, the old patrimony of that dynasty in Germany, which was ceded to Prussia; and it settled the Grand Duchy upon the Sovereign of the Netherlands in his own right, at the same time making him, in so far as the Grand Duchy was concerned, a member of the German Confederation. William I, however, treated Luxemburg exactly like the other provinces of the kingdom of the Netherlands. He gave seats in the States General to its

deputies, and invariably enforced the laws and institutions of the Netherlands there. Moreover, he deliberately neglected to fulfil his obligations towards the German Confederation, although these obligations were of the lightest, as the Confederation was a mere defensive alliance. He refused to provide the federal military contingent claimed by the Diet of Frankfurt; and it was his wish to turn the federal garrison out of the fortress of Luxemburg. The presence of this garrison, a body of Prussian soldiers, was the only sign of the difference made in international law between the Grand Duchy and the other Belgian provinces. The Grand Duchy, therefore, was a mere diplomatic fiction, an artificial creation intended to satisfy dynastic interests without regarding either historical traditions or the wishes of the inhabitants.

When the Revolution broke out, in September 1830, the people of Luxemburg mostly joined it with enthusiasm; and, as the French Government said some months after, they showed themselves 'more Belgian than the Belgians anywhere else.' Still, they did not attack the fortress, the gates of which were immediately closed by the commander of the Prussian garrison, who declared that the revolutionaries were rebels. On Oct. 15, William I's representative with the Diet called upon it to intervene, and promised that his Sovereign would henceforth strictly fulfil his federal duties and use every means to support the federal (i.e. Prussian) garrison quartered in Luxemburg. The situation might have become very critical, had not the Conference of London promptly taken the decision to suspend hostilities between Belgian and Dutch troops (November). This decision was to exercise the most unfavourable influence upon the future of Belgium, and especially upon its territorial status, for at that time only the old 'Barrier' fortresses built against France had passed into Belgian possession. The more important strongholds of the interior, the Citadel of Antwerp and Maastricht, were still in the hands of the Dutch; and Luxemburg was in the power of the German Confederation. The truce did not extend to the Grand Duchy, as the Congress of Vienna had placed it in a peculiar political position. Nevertheless, there was a tacit armistice, for the Provisional Government of

Belgium did not care to give offence to the Confederation, or to Prussia, whose King, Frederick William III, appeared to act in a more or less conciliatory spirit. Therefore the Prussian garrison in the city of Luxemburg was left undisturbed, and the rights of the Confederation were expressly safeguarded by the National Congress of Belgium in its declaration of independence.

Nevertheless, it was Prussia that called upon the Diet to intervene vigorously for the suppression of the successful rising of the population in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, although Prussia had no legal standing there whatever. Bernstorff, the Prussian Minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote to Vienna (Nov. 1): 'The Confederation would be dishonoured and would have to renounce all political hopes for the future, if it failed to perform its duty in such serious circumstances;' and at the same time he informed Baron Bülow, the representative of Prussia at the Conference of London, that 'the connexion of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and of the fortress with the German Confederation must in any case be preserved. Any attempt at changing it by force must be treated as an infringement of federal rights and of sacred treaties, due to the agreement of all Europe.'

The Prussian Government, however, consented to the employment of peaceful means before resorting to compulsion, to the great anger of Tsar Nicholas, who deplored the fact that Prussia did not at once reinforce the garrison of the town of Luxemburg. As soon as the French Government learned of the appeal sent by Prussia to the Diet, it insisted that the Diet itself, instead of the Courts of Berlin or Vienna, should take the settlement of the Luxemburg question in hand, and informed the two Courts of its views in the matter. It even declared, on Oct. 17, that it would in no case tolerate an armed intervention in Belgium. The Diet refused, after mature deliberation, to acknowledge the Belgians in Luxemburg as belligerents, and decided to treat them as rebels and to dispatch a federal 'army of execution' into their province. At that time, a large section of public opinion in Germany, especially in the Rhine district, was favourably disposed towards the rebels and held Liberal views; many members of the Diet were afraid to offend

it and strove to delay action so as to prevent an outburst. On Nov. 18, the Diet applied to the Prussian and Austrian Governments by a confidential message, asking them to take action at the Conference of London so as to render an armed intervention of the Confederation superfluous. Blittersdorff, the representative of Baden in the Diet, subsequently made an abortive attempt to have the Confederation represented at the London Conference.

The protocol of Dec. 20, by which the future independence of Belgium was sanctioned in principle, was the second important act of the Conference which ultimately led to the separation of Luxemburg from Belgium. It expressly provided that the arrangements to be made should 'in no way affect the rights which the King of the Netherlands and the German Confederation exercise in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg.' At the same time, the Conference requested its Commissioners in Brussels to take an opportunity to advise the Belgian Government to refrain from interference in the affairs of the Grand Duchy. This protocol, which was not officially brought to the notice of the Belgian Government before the night of Dec. 31, aroused profound indignation. The Government declared that they could only accept it under protest, and addressed a note to the Conference setting forth its territorial claims (Zealand-Flanders, Maastricht, Luxemburg). This pretension was regarded as exorbitant, as a claim to 'the right of aggrandisement and of conquest.' The Conference returned this note, with the reply that it could not allow to any State a privilege which the Powers denied to themselves.

The discord between Belgium and the Conference might have endangered the existence of the new State, if at that very time the chance that the Prince of Orange might be raised to the throne of Belgium had not been on the increase. This combination might have solved the question of Luxemburg. Palmerston suggested it to Talleyrand in the course of a conversation. 'King William (he said) would have ceded Luxemburg to his son, provided the Duke were chosen King by the Belgians; and they would have elected him on condition of obtaining Luxemburg.' Then Talleyrand explained that the Grand Duchy was on no account to be attached to Belgium, because of its connexion with the German

Confederation, and 'he hinted that it might come to France; the consequence would have been a partition of Belgium itself, or at least the yielding to the other Powers of Belgian territory or of some other advantages. Palmerston opposed this system vigorously and insisted that 'England had no selfish objects in view in the arrangements of Belgium, but wished Belgium to be really and substantially independent.' Talleyrand had made a similar attempt with Bülow, the Prussian plenipotentiary, who also refused to be seduced.

There were other signs showing that Louis Philippe found it hard to resist the pressure of the 'party of movement' which demanded an increase of territory on the Belgian frontier. In order to put an end to such ambitious schemes, the Conference of London, at Prussia's request, decreed the neutralisation of Belgium under the guarantee of the Powers, and, at the same time, the preservation of the connexion between the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the German Confederation. Talleyrand strove in vain to extend neutrality to Luxemburg, alleging the precarious position of the French frontier in that quarter, in case of a war against its eastern neighbours. But Palmerston replied that France had no invasion to fear on that side. Moreover, he added, Luxemburg 'seems to belong to the system of defence for the Prussian frontier of which Coblenz is the centre; and it must be important for Prussia, as flanking the line of advance from Thionville to Coblenz.'

Talleyrand fought 'like a dragon,' Palmerston says, to carry his combination regarding Luxemburg, and even pretended that without it he would not assent to Belgian neutrality, but he was probably confronted with an argument afterwards used by the Prussian Government—that the German Confederation was indeed organised solely for purposes of defence, but that it was by no means neutral. The representative of France was unable to obtain anything except the insertion at the end of the protocol of an article permitting other countries to join in recognising the neutrality of Belgium. The clear result of this decision of the Conference was to separate Luxemburg more and more from the rest of Belgium, as the latter was given an entirely different international status. The Luxemburg question was henceforth kept

wholly distinct from the Belgian question, as the Conference declared itself incompetent to solve the former. This was a few days later announced by Talleyrand to his Government in these words: 'We have not, as you seem to imagine, solved the question of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg; it has been transmitted to those that have the right and the power to deal with it.' He forgot, or pretended to forget, that the renunciation by the Conference of interference in the affairs of Luxemburg was in itself highly significant, and demonstrated the British Cabinet's determination to join the three autocratic Powers for the maintenance of the European system set up by the Congress of Vienna.

The decisions of the Conference inevitably gave offence to the majority of Belgians, and their effect was exactly the opposite of what had been hoped. The National Congress of Belgium protested on Feb. 1, 1831, against any delimitation of their territory and against any obligation that might be laid upon Belgium without the consent of its national representatives. In this sense, they raised their protest against the protocol of Jan. 20 'in so far as the Powers could have an intention of imposing it on Belgium'; declaring that 'they would never submit to a decision that would infringe the integrity of their territory and maim their national representation, and would always insist with the foreign Powers on the principle of non-intervention.'

At the same time, Belgium turned more and more towards France. Instead of losing ground, the French propaganda extended more and more; and France now appeared as the advocate of the territorial interests of Belgium. At last, in defiance of the wishes and warnings of the Conference, the Belgian Congress elected Louis Philippe's son, the Duke of Nemours, for their king. Although his majority was only one or two votes, the candidature of the Prince of Orange was at any rate quashed for good; and the Luxemburg question became all the more complicated, as a personal union between the Grand Duchy and Belgium was no longer possible. King William himself had never favoured it, for he looked upon the Luxemburg question as an excellent weapon against the Belgians. This personal union was no less obnoxious to the French, even if it had been

enacted in favour of any other ruler than the Prince of Orange; for the aim of most French statesmen was to break off all links, however loose, that might connect the Sovereign of Belgium with the German Confederation. The Conference expressed the strongest disapproval of the attitude of the Belgians, and in a lengthy protocol (Feb. 19), for which Bülow provided the materials, it justified all the measures it had taken with regard to them. Among other things it declared that they had no right to alter the international political system, and should conform to existing treaties; it denied them what it termed 'the power of invading,' because it was 'a danger to peace and to social order.' This ultimately meant that they had to evacuate Luxemburg.

On March 13, 1831, when Casimir Périer formed a Cabinet that favoured peace and opposed the republicans, there was a better feeling between Prussia and France. Therefore Bülow and Esterhazy, one of his Austrian colleagues at the Conference, promised to take steps with the Diet of Frankfurt to prevent the executive measures which it had decided upon with regard to Luxemburg. The French Government, on its part, formally recognised that the Grand Duchy (with the exception of the tiny old Duchy of Bouillon) 'belonged and ought to belong to the House of Nassau and continued a part of the German Confederation.' It deliberately issued this recognition after the demonstration organised in mid-March at the instigation of the deputies from Luxemburg in the Congress, in order to protest against the proclamation of Duke Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, the King of Holland's Commissioner in the Grand Duchy, ordering the inhabitants to submit within a month. The eighteen Luxemburg Deputies had drawn up a protest which they had obliged the Regent of Belgium, Baron Surlet de Chokier, to sign. This paper, which was couched in vehement language, contained the following sentence among others: 'The Congress has protested against the action of the London Conference.' Upon this General Sebastiani, the French Foreign Minister, remarked: 'The Belgians are lunatics, and what is worse, ill-bred lunatics. M. Surlet de Chokier has made a rude and indecent mistake'; and he went so far as to threaten the Belgian representative in Paris with 'leaving the Belgians to their fate,'

though he confessed to the Austrian Minister in Paris that 'this was more easily said than done.' The immediate result of the Regent's proclamation was to decide the Diet of Frankfurt to dispatch an 'army of execution' of 24,000 men, and to put the garrison of the fortress of Luxemburg on a war footing. Against a too hasty carrying-out of this decision the French Government acted with success.

Meanwhile the Regent's second Cabinet, presided over by Lebeau (March 1831), reversing the policy of a close and exclusive union with France, was on its part looking for a way out of the Luxemburg difficulty. It aimed at entering into relations with the German Confederation by opening up a prospect of economic advantages. The Confederation was then a league of practically independent States; and Prussia herself was suffering from revolutionary tendencies and not yet showing signs of her later ambitions. Therefore Lebeau gave her, through M. Behr, the Belgian representative in Berlin, the most formal assurances as to the object of the Belgian Revolution. Belgium's attitude with regard to Luxemburg was not to be 'interpreted as prompted by hostility towards Germany; it had announced that it would respect the rights of the German Confederation, and would keep its word. . . .' In another series of instructions he added:

'Luxemburg would remain as a link with the Confederation, . . . and it would not be impossible for the whole of Belgium to join it one day, if certain clauses of the federal constitution, which limited the independence and sovereignty of individual states, were amended. . . .'

Behr was now dismissed in Berlin, and the head of the Department of Foreign Affairs simply told him in parting that Prussia had no business with Belgium except through the Conference of London. Another envoy of the Belgian Government with the Diet of Frankfurt had no better luck. Those two embassies were reported, exaggerated and distorted to the French Government, which showed itself extremely discontented and less than ever willing to compromise itself by supporting Belgian demands regarding Luxemburg. At that time 'perfect agreement' prevailed among the Great Powers on the question of the frontiers of Belgium. Henceforth the

German Diet might think of using means of coercion 'in order to clear itself of any blame,' but it made its preparations with wise deliberation, in obedience to the advice of the Conference of London, whose chief aim was the preservation of European peace. It even entrusted the duty of sending contingents to States far remote from the Luxemburg territory—to Hanover, Holstein, Oldenburg, the Hansa Towns and Mecklenburg. Hanover, and afterwards the other States, raised difficulties about the payment of the expenses occasioned by such expeditions, so that the decisions of the Diet could not be carried into effect. Talleyrand rightly wrote to his Government:

'The Diet . . . is not at liberty to decide alone in a matter of such gravity; the Conference always retains the power to send it advice, and I can certify you . . . that no order to attack will leave Frankfurt before the Conference has sent word that no way of reaching a compromise is left.'

Meanwhile Prussia had of its own accord doubled the garrison of the fortress of Luxemburg with troops of her own; and, when 1400 men from Lippe-Detmold, Bückeburg and Waldeck arrived to reinforce them, the Prussian Commander of the fortress, on his own authority, granted them the Prussian pay, which was higher than anywhere else in Germany, and trained them in the Prussian manner, in order to cure them of a taste for mutiny which they had indulged on their march to the fortress. As to the 'army of execution' itself, it never came within sight of the frontiers of Luxemburg.

By its protocol of May 10, the Conference had fixed June 1 as the date by which Belgium must agree to the bases of separation laid down in January. When that term was past, the Confederation might occupy the territory of Luxemburg by force. The two Commissioners representing the Conference with the Belgian Government were afraid that the agitation in Belgium might lead to another revolution, and therefore did not venture to make this protocol known officially; and the Conference rejected a proposal from Lebeau, the Belgian Foreign Minister, that he should meet his Dutch colleague in a foreign town in order to prepare the bases of agreement between Belgium and Holland on the question of frontiers. The Conference itself desired to deal with

this question, although it seemed insoluble, and also to settle the choice of a sovereign :

'I do not see our way out of the Belgian difficulties,' wrote Palmerston to Granville, British Minister at Paris; 'Prince Leopold will not accept till the Belgians have acceded to the Act of Separation; and they, on the other hand, say that they cannot accede to that Act in the present state of the country, nor until they have a sovereign, chambers, and a regular government. Here we are, then, at a deadlock.' And he concluded: 'The Luxemburg question might be made a subject of ulterior negotiation.'

Some days later he told the delegates of the Belgian Congress, who had come to London in order to offer the crown to Prince Leopold, that they 'must agree to the "*bases de séparation*" in substance or in form, and then they might negotiate as they liked about exchanges afterwards.' It was in this sense that the Conference settled its protocol on May 21, but it did not cancel its decision as to the term fixed for the acceptance of the basis of separation by Belgium. The Belgian Congress took no notice of this ultimatum and elected Leopold (June 4), providing that he was to take an oath to the preservation of the integrity of the territory as defined by the Belgian Constitution.

While offending the Belgians, the attitude of the Conference had also hurt the King of Holland. He was greatly discontented at the Luxemburg question being left unsolved without his being consulted, for he had hoped to turn it into a stumbling-block for Europe and into the chief obstacle to the establishment of the Belgian State. It was even rumoured that he was secretly negotiating with the French Government for the partition of Belgium. Whether this was true or not, all kinds of intrigues were multiplying and combining at that period, while the existence of the new State was still very precarious. Finally, the Conference decided to solve the question of the sovereign before that of the frontiers. Prince Leopold, being elected by the Belgian Congress by a large majority, became the King of a State whose limits were still undecided.

After several weeks of laborious negotiations with the delegates of the Congress, the Conference settled the

preliminaries of the XVIII Articles (June 26), leaving both the question of Luxemburg and that of Maastricht in suspense, preserving the military *status quo*, so that the Belgians retained possession of the territory of Luxemburg, and ordering negotiations about the Duchy between Holland and the German Confederation on the one hand, and Belgium on the other. The preliminaries gave satisfaction to France in so far as the new sovereign was no member of the German Confederation. The French Government, and King Louis Philippe himself, had informed Talleyrand that this sovereign could not in any way join the Confederation :

‘It is necessary (wrote the Government) that this ruler should throughout his kingdom be entirely free towards the Powers ; this necessity is but the inevitable consequence of the principle of neutrality laid down by the Conference in favour of Belgium. The complete independence of the Belgian crown is to us a question of alliances and of frontiers.’

In his speech from the throne (July 24), King Louis Philippe laid stress on this fact, and interpreted it as an important success for his diplomacy.

The King of Holland's refusal to adhere to the XVIII Articles, and his sudden attack on Belgium early in August 1831, turned the Powers against him ; but the quick successes of his troops, which were stopped only by the rapid and vigorous advance of a French army, proved the undeniable superiority of the military organisation of Holland over that of Belgium, which was only in its beginnings. The Conference of London, acting as an arbitration court, settled all problems relating to Belgium on its own authority, and decided, by the XXIV Articles, to hand the fortress of Maastricht to the King of Holland, and that of Luxemburg to the German Confederation. King William I obtained a considerable extension of territory by the cession of the northern and eastern half of Limburg, including what was formerly Belgian Guelderland, which connected Maastricht with Dutch territory. He had himself suggested to the representative of Prussia, at the Conference of London, the exchange of the western half of the province of Luxemburg for these districts. This arrangement had already been produced in the course

of the negotiations between Prince Leopold and the Conference, and it agreed with the wishes of the British Cabinet, which wanted Holland to be strong enough to resist a possible French attack. Lord Grey declared in the House of Lords (Oct. 18) that it was 'England's interest to provide first for the defensive position of Holland, and then, in the second place, to assure to Belgium the advantages of an independent nation.'

For France, also, this combination was of considerable advantage, as her northern border was better covered through the extension of the neutralised territory in the western half of Luxemburg. Longwy and Verdun were no longer directly threatened by Luxemburg. This was Louis Philippe's reward for his decisive intervention in the Dutch-Belgian war. Sebastiani wished to secure some compensations for Belgium in what is called Zealand-Flanders, at the mouth of the Scheldt, but Périer, whose chief concern was the maintenance of peace, let the matter drop. 'What does it matter,' wrote Dalberg, one of his colleagues, on Oct. 3, 1831, 'whether the Belgians have a few villages more or less? The main point is that peace should be preserved.' So it came about that Belgium was deprived of all means of defence on the east, and lost a territory equal in extent to two of its provinces. As Louis Philippe afterwards admitted in a letter to Leopold I, 'the possession of the fortresses of Maastricht and Luxemburg by Belgium's neighbours makes the defence of the Belgian provinces of Limburg and Luxemburg impossible.' The Powers had agreed to prevent Belgium from acquiring solidity sufficient for military resistance; they lessened her capacity for defence, because they believed that neutrality afforded her sufficient protection. Most of the statesmen of the time completely overlooked the principle once laid down by Wellington:

'The Powers of Europe are to guarantee this independence and neutrality. Are these advantages to depend only upon the good faith with which each is expected to perform his engagements? Must it not likewise depend upon the ability of the guaranteed Power to protect itself?'

The XXIV Articles were in November 1831 turned into a treaty without any alteration in their territorial

provisions, but the King of Holland refused to adhere to it. Belgium, therefore, remained temporarily in possession of all Luxemburg, except the federal fortress, the garrison of which was again placed on a peace footing on Oct. 27. The small federal contingents posted there returned to their respective countries, but the King of Prussia immediately ordered the commander of the Rhine corps to supply reinforcements, if necessary, to the Prussian troops stationed in Luxemburg.

The *status quo* continued till 1839, when the King of Holland finally decided to subscribe to the XXIV Articles. Notwithstanding the efforts made by the Belgian Government, and especially by Leopold I, to obtain an extension of territory, the Governments of France and England would not revise those provisions, because they were afraid of disturbing the balance of Europe. Louis Philippe and Queen Victoria pressed King Leopold to submit to a renunciation of the Limburg and Luxemburg territories denied him by the Powers in 1831. Leopold did not omit to acquaint the two sovereigns who were friendly to Belgium with the inconveniences caused to his country by the 'arrangements forced on her,' and with the humiliation felt at her 'so-called political independence.' He wrote to Queen Victoria (April 19, 1839): 'It is very melancholy . . . to see, after eight years of hard work, blooming and thriving political plantations cut and maimed, and that by those who have a real interest in protecting them. . . .'

During the transition period 1831-1839, the Prussian commander of the garrison of Luxemburg distinguished himself by his brutality and arbitrary ways. He repeatedly extended the boundary of the fortress till it reached a radius of four leagues, and thus multiplied the occasions of quarrelling with the Belgian authorities. One day he ordered a Belgian to be flogged, pretending that he had advised a Prussian soldier to desert—this method of repression, Treitschke remarks, was very beneficent. Another time, he caused a whole squad of Belgian custom-house guards to be imprisoned because they were acting within the radius of the fortress. He frequently prevented recruits from the vicinity of Luxemburg from joining their regiments. It was no wonder, then, the black and white colours of Prussia,

which had for nine years defied the Belgian tricolour, appeared to the Luxemburgers as a symbol of tyranny, as Treitschke himself admits, while the city of Luxemburg itself suffered from the isolation in which it had all that time been kept by its Prussian garrison.

In later years, when the National Anthem of the Grand Duchy was composed, after the Dutch sovereign had granted a separate constitution to its inhabitants, an indissoluble connexion was felt to exist between patriotism and the hatred of Prussia. The refrain at first was: 'We want to remain what we are,' but instead of this the public sing: 'We don't want to be Prussians.' Treitschke ruefully remarks, in vol. iv of his 'History of Germany in the 19th Century,' which he concluded in 1889, that anti-Prussian demonstrations were multiplying there with ever-increasing success. Natives of the Grand Duchy have never to this day been wholly foreigners in Belgium; they often join the Belgian army, and many are serving with the colours in the present war. They are also numerous in other public services, particularly in the State schools, where their command of French and German makes them useful. The Grand Duchy, having no university of its own, sends many students to the Belgian universities; as its civil law still is the Code Napoléon, its lawyers must be trained in legal Faculties where that Code is being taught, viz. those of Belgium or France. The official language is French.

As may well be guessed, the Luxemburgers' hatred of Prussian tyranny has not been lessened by the late disastrous invasion of their country, and they desire a peace that will free them from the incubus of German militarism. They look forward to being in some way reunited to the old Belgian motherland from which they were torn by force, and against the will of the people.

H. VANDER LINDEN.



THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

AS AB, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

## Art. 3.—NATIONAL CHURCHES AND NATIONAL LIFE. ✓

1. (a) *Gregory the Great*. (b) *Augustine the Missionary*.  
(c) *The Golden Age of the English Church* (Three vols).  
By Sir Henry Howorth. Murray, 1912-17.
2. *The Christian Church in Gaul*. By Rev. Canon Scott Holmes. Macmillan, 1911.
3. *Constantine the Great and Christianity*. By Prof. C. B. Coleman. Columbia University Press, 1914.
4. *The Conversion of Europe*. By the Rev. C. H. Robinson, D.D. Longmans, 1917.

THE man who labours in past matters can hardly hope to find his work popular to-day. Our interests are centred on great happenings; the men of action, and not the men of research, are the heroes of the hour. The newspaper absorbs our attention; we prefer telegrams to treatises, even when they sparkle with illustrations and commend themselves by patient erudition. What happened yesterday in France or Flanders, in Russia or Palestine, is of more moment than the missionary successes of St Columba or the conversion of Constantine. And yet, if we can abstract our minds from present events and spare an hour to give a backward glance, we may reap some profit, for in the past are the upper springs, the fountains whence flow the forces whose might astonishes us to-day. The conflicts of to-day have their origin in the past. Silently and unobserved the forces were born, which under the fashioning hand of time took the forms which now are seen in collision; for evolution, that word which embodies our knowledge and exemplifies our ignorance, is not, as I understand it, a process of continuous and uniform advance, but rather a series of independent and tentative advances in which one structure is 'sacrificed for the development of another.' This law of 'economy of growth' meets us frequently in human history, when types of civilisation contend with one another for the mastery.

We hear, and it is natural that we should hear, a great deal of talk about the policy to be adopted after the war. Popular attention readily turns to the economic conditions which will then prevail; it is realised that our future welfare will largely depend upon the policy which

we apply to matters of trade and finance; it is realised more clearly than ever that education is a large factor in success. So far, so good; no prudent citizen will quarrel with the sagacity which calls attention to matters so closely related to national welfare. But these are not the only matters towards which our thoughts should be turned. The life of a people is not in commerce merely, or in commercial values reinforced by a wider, longer and more elaborate system of education. Behind all these lies the question of nationality and of the influences which contribute to the security of national life. Commerce is important, and the consideration of economic conditions after the war is therefore urgent; education is important, and more important than commerce, for on education rests commercial capacity; but more important than either of these is the religion of the people, for out of this grow the habits of reverence, of truth, and of love of right, which in their turn determine national character, and it is on character that the stability and continuance of national life depend.

For all those who are interested (and who is not interested?) in the future development of national life, the question of religion must hold a supreme position. It is, moreover, by a study of the past that we shall be able to understand the conditions of the present and best lay plans for the future. The watersheds of national history are worthy of exploration. We can welcome, therefore, the labours of any historian who has dug deep into the foundations of national life, and can exhibit to us the facts, deeds, documents, and even the historic stones, on which he has based his story. This feature constitutes one merit of Sir Henry Howorth's works; he has flanked and buttressed his narrative with abundant evidential material. A veteran in public life and activity, he has recently given us five volumes which deal directly and indirectly with the making of English nationality. On the other hand, the influence of the Gallican Church upon the history of France comes before us in Canon Scott Holmes' Birkbeck Lectures. Thus the cradle-time of two great nationalities is brought to our notice at the moment when, as allies, they are fighting the cause of Nationality in Europe. At first it might be thought that we were being swept away into an irrelevantly

distant time and place by having our attention at the same time claimed by such a book as Prof. Coleman's monograph on the Emperor Constantine; but here we are carried back to the root of the tree of good and evil, under whose shadow the conflicting claims of Church and State have been fought during many centuries. A certain completeness is given to the series of books under consideration by the opportune work of Canon Charles H. Robinson, who has given us in a single volume a survey of the missionary enterprise which led to the Christianisation of Europe.

The period of English history which Sir Henry Howorth has selected is one which needs to be better understood in order that its influence upon later ages may be recognised. It is an early and formative epoch which has attracted his attention, and to which, after having discoursed upon the characters and careers of two pioneers of the epoch, he now devotes his latest and most important work. He has given us careful studies of St Gregory and St Augustine before entering upon the story of what he calls 'The Golden Days of the Early English Church.'

In citing the title of this work, we perceive at once the theme which we have to consider. It is the influence of the Church in the development of national life. This is, no doubt, a theme which may plunge us into controversy. The utterance of the phrase 'Church and State' causes men to start up in eager antagonism. The bias of party; the prejudices which party accepts as sacred canons; the unhappy habit of taking short-range views, and dating either Church or national history from some favourite movement or achievement; the exaggerated hero-worship which theological prepossession encourages—all these make the subject a thorny and bewildering one, in which the ardent pursuit of side-issues is fatal to the understanding of the meaning of national development in its fullest, truest and noblest aspect. It is fortunate that at present, owing to the serious questions which the war has brought into prominence, there seems to be a healthier disposition abroad; men are ready to take wider views. It will, perhaps, be possible for us to consider the question of the Church as a factor in national development, without

wandering into profitless by-paths or raising the ghosts of controversies which it is the part of wisdom to bury out of sight.

Behind the story of all, or nearly all, national churches, there stands the shadow of one figure, which for good or evil flung the aura of his influence upon Christendom. The Emperor Constantine has been given the title of Great; he has been belauded and belittled; by some he has been hailed as a saint, by others he has been described as an ambitious hypocrite. It was natural enough that contending parties should exaggerate or attenuate his fame to suit their purpose; and, though centuries have passed and the passions of earlier times have abated, there is still enough theoretical or theological partisanship in the world to upset the balance or tarnish the charity of our judgment.

We can welcome, therefore, Prof. Coleman's treatise, for, however much we may hesitate to accept his conclusions on minor matters, we must be impressed by the careful and dispassionate character of his work. His conspicuous caution and sagacious independence of mind awaken confidence in his general conclusions; and it is a relief to pass from the heated atmosphere of party views, and to contemplate in a clearer light the portrait of the Emperor sketched by an impartial hand.

The reputation of Constantine has been imperilled alike by eulogist and antagonist, because his name is identified with the greatest religious change which ever transformed an Empire. In the eyes of the world, Constantine found the Empire pagan and left it Christian. In the circumstances, it is hardly to be wondered at that Christian gratitude, let alone human flattery, should place a halo on his head; but Prof. Coleman, if we are not mistaken, would endorse Niebuhr's words: 'When certain Oriental writers call him equal to the Apostles, they do not know what they are saying; and to speak of him as a saint is a profanation of the word.' His desires were not towards the halo of saintship, but towards the helmet 'studded with jewels' and adorned with the Oriental diadem which he, first of the emperors, made a practice of wearing. He loved display, whether in splendour of purple and gold apparel, or in orations on

the faith which had brought him victory. When arrayed in imperial robes, he knew himself to be successor of the emperors who ruled the world, or the conqueror who founded new Rome; but, when he harangued the eager crowd of Christians who applauded his periods, we cannot imagine him speaking with the ardour or conviction of St Paul, or the childlike confidence of St John. His genius lay elsewhere; his vigorous onslaughts in battle, his effective victories, his edict of toleration, his patronage of the clergy, combine to give us the picture of a capable commander in war and an astute opportunist in policy.

He was not a zealous Christian filled with a burning faith in Christ; he was the man of prudent hesitations, whose views of religion developed according to the hopes and ambitions engendered by a calculating spirit not wholly emancipated from superstitious notions. It suited Christian writers to exaggerate any evidence of his faith and piety, but he had, especially early in his reign, pagan eulogists; only later did he assume Christianity, and then only gradually. The truth appears to have been that the men of that generation were not aware of the decisive struggle which was being fought; none realised that the predominance of paganism or of Christianity was at issue. It was not till Julian's time that it became clear that the day of paganism was over; and it was only when the victory was so obvious that it could not be ignored that pagan dislike of Constantine developed into bitter hostility. Constantine no doubt shared the contemporary blindness to the signs of the times; and his ultimate adhesion to Christianity was probably due to a blend of superstition and opportunism.

It would be a mistake to regard him either as the embodiment of unscrupulous ambition or as a man unselfishly free from all ambitious projects. He seems rather to have been one who followed circumstances with a certain adroit wariness, and to have found success not in courageous ambition but in a cautiousness which could be brave on occasions, especially when omens were propitious. To the last he was superstitious; his Christianity never reached the clear ethical conviction of a divine order; in him a lame regard for the outward symbol of the new faith allied itself with an essential

paganism of conception. 'There was not (says Mr Coleman) a great deal of difference between Constantine consulting the omens at the temple of Apollo at Autun, and Constantine seeking miraculous guidance in battle in his tabernacle, as described by Eusebius.'

If history is of any value, it ought at least to remind us that, where good seed is sown in a field which once grew a crop of tares, the tares will mingle with the wheat. There is a latent paganism which may be called a by-product of Christianity, and which is somewhat needlessly cultivated by clericalism. There was no soil more prolific of this by-product than that of Latium; in fact, we are tempted to ask whether it was ever eradicated from the soil. Christian teachers, moreover, soon found it an easier task to rename pagan customs than to convert pagan hearts; the Christianity which Constantine made popular was hardly better than a thin veneer, which concealed but did not disturb substantial paganism of conception. The conflict between paganism and Christianity ended as invasions have frequently ended; the defeated gave laws to the victors, and the outcome of the conversion of Constantine was the paganised Christianity which has always been more popular than the faith of Christ.

A further mischief was wrought when a vigorous impetus was given to clericalism. The officials of the Church gained, partly through the fact that they alone were educated, and partly because they were regarded as the successors of a pagan priesthood; the idea of clerical domination was acquiesced in, if not accepted; and the Forged Decretals were little more than the formulation of claims already existent if not conceded. When Dante bewailed the fatal gift of Constantine to the Church, he bewailed a misfortune greater than even he understood; but, if Dante failed to estimate fully the evil consequences—'di quanto mal fu matre . . . quella dote' ('Inf.' xix. 115)—his courage in denouncing it must be reckoned the greater when we remember, as Prof. Coleman reminds us, that the Donation was everywhere regarded as genuine. Dante put himself against the current of accepted opinion and against what claimed to be legalised, if not consecrated, authority. Dante's instinct was right; behind the glamour of a great name

vile influences were at work. The name of Constantine was one to conjure by; it was synonymous with the triumph of the faith; whatever could be attributed to his initiative seemed to be invested with the benediction of a divine success. The bright light which hovered over the water when he was baptised and healed him of his leprosy has hovered over all his decrees; and the forgeries of later times have been invested with a sanctity which a people taught docility by arrogance had not the courage to doubt.

Meanwhile, the development of national life was nevertheless going forward in Europe; and to-day there is no topic more profoundly interesting to us than that of nationality. What subject, therefore, can be fuller of teaching than the story of the upbuilding of vigorous and coherent nations, equipped to take their place in the world's progress and strong enough and self-contained enough to fulfil their destiny? How needful to note the various factors which have contributed to their growth and vitality! How desirable to estimate these factors at their true value, and to measure how much of their success is due to situation, to climate, to blood, to religion!

As a help to the formation of a just estimate, Canon Charles Robinson's work will be welcomed by students of the sources of modern civilisation. To read it is to realise in some measure how large a part Christian missions have played in the structure of national life in Europe. Canon Robinson fitly begins his survey with Ireland. Ireland, whose future causes so much anxious thought to-day, is seen in this story as the cradle of missionary enterprise. Criticism has rendered nebulous the atmosphere which surrounds St Patrick, but he still wears the halo of saintship. There may be blemishes in the characters of Columba and Columbanus, but they sustain nevertheless the glory of the missionary zeal which distinguished the island of saints. But, while Canon Robinson does justice to the heroic men who hazarded their lives to preach among the heathen, he is careful to note the corruption of the true missionary spirit. Eager zeal was often content with superficial work; it was easier to veneer customs than to influence character; and, when Christianity was adopted by monarchs, force was too

readily employed, till at last coercion became praiseworthy zeal. Thus it was a short step from unreality to persecution. Against such methods Alcuin raised his voice—'Let your most wise and God-pleasing piety provide for the new people pious preachers, of honest life, learned in the knowledge of the holy faith.'

Two lessons may well be learned from this work—first, the need of patience on the part of those who would regenerate the world. Let those who deem modern missionary work unsuccessful because it is slow, remember that fourteen hundred years elapsed before Europe became nominally Christian. The other lesson is the importance of wise and honest methods in missionary work; shallow haste and unconscientious zeal defeat themselves and leave a burdened legacy to after ages. The painstaking patience which has so happily condensed a mass of incorrigible material is worthy of all praise. The art which combines missionary ardour with a just and sagacious judgment is an evidence of impartiality and inspires confidence.

The Christian Churches have of late been arraigned before the bar of public opinion. The crisis in human judgments which the war has created has given rise to mild censures and severe reproaches, rising to harsh and unsparing condemnation. Even a clear spirit like Captain Hankey could pass stern sentence upon the Church, while the friends of institutional religion have rushed into the fray with words of defence more damaging than the hard language of foes, and other friends with well-meaning thoughtlessness have championed suicide as a sure remedy for ecclesiastical valetudinarianism. All the painful and hopeless ambiguities of ordinary controversy have been imported into the tumult, till the proverbial man in the street wonders what it all means, and continues to follow duty or business with less expectancy than ever of ecclesiastical help. Meanwhile, the religious sense of the people is quietly formulating its own views of religion, and with deepened seriousness of mind yearns for the simplicity of earlier faith.

It is in such a crisis as this that the works of Sir Henry Howorth and of Canon Scott Holmes invite us once more to study the function of the Church in the story

of national development. At first we might be tempted to exclaim that the periods dealt with in these books are too remote, too unlike our own busy and breathless times to give us any useful or practical hints; but reflection will teach us to modify such a view. If, as has been maintained by thoughtful students, the history of European nations is so indissolubly bound up with the history of the Church or Churches that national development cannot be adequately understood apart from religious history, then every period in which the Church has been a factor in the growth and guidance of a people's life is charged with teaching which is worthy of note.

It is only shallow or narrow knowledge which ignores the part which the Church has played in national life. The late Sir John Seeley will not be accused of strong ecclesiastical proclivities, yet he wrote:

'I have always held that religion is the great state-building principle. These colonists [in New England] could create a new State, because they were already a Church, since the Church, so at least I hold, is the soul of the State. Where there is a Church the State grows up in time, but, if you find a State which is not also in some sense a Church, you find a State which is not long for this world.' \*

It is interesting at this time to find the expression of a parallel opinion given by a German *savant*, Prof. Behr of Munich, who tells us that it is the best established doctrine of Historical Philosophy that all the power, prosperity, and mental energy of a race or nation have sprung from and lived by its religion; and so keen-sighted a writer as M. Paul Sabatier has recently told us that the history of the Gallican Church is in some periods and in some aspects the history of France.

It is here that the value of historical studies possesses a real interest. The story of the past is a story of readjustments to new conditions. It is not by a hard, undeviating worship of the past that our ancestors found the way to freedom in national life, nor was it by wantonly discarding the forces and institutions which exerted a formative influence on the people's character; it was by a wise and wholesome adaptation of an old

---

\* 'Expansion of England,' Lecture VIII, p. 154.

organisation to new conditions. Our ancestors felt instinctively that organisations were the resultants of certain ideas which were found to be healthful; and in their efforts at readjustment they sought in the quickening or revival of the original idea the path which was equally that of wisdom and of freedom.

It is the blindness of partisan writers to this principle which moved Prof. Paul Sabatier to draw a picture of the mischievous results of unscientific methods of teaching history. French life, he tells us, has been under the tyranny of a double prejudice; the unfortunate cleavage between Church and State has created a mental atmosphere deficient in candour; neither the ecclesiastic nor the anti-ecclesiastic has been able to write honest history. Preliminary prejudice has vitiated all their efforts. The ecclesiastic sees no national life; the anti-ecclesiastic ignores all Church life; the result is that the history of France is not told to the French people. Yet there is no writing the history of France, any more than the history of England, without touching the history of the Church; for the history of the Church at some epochs was the history of the nation.

Sir Henry Howorth reaches the same conclusion as M. Paul Sabatier. In his preface (pp. ix, x) he tells us that this was his earliest conviction when he contemplated his task of writing as historian.

‘The first thing which struck me was that, if the work was to be done with any lasting profit, we must begin by exploring our early ecclesiastical history more minutely and thoroughly before facing the problem of its civil and secular side. The first people who wrote our annals, drew up our charters, and composed our memorials on stone, were priests and monks and nuns. . . . It is inevitable that we should know a great deal more about the early ecclesiastical history of England than we do about its civil history; and, if we are to examine the latter profitably, we must plant our feet on the more solid basis, which is buttressed by more adequate evidence. Having done so, we can use the vantage ground so gained for the purpose of exploring its complementary field where the mists hang heavier on the areas we wish to explore.’

The books before us deal with the religious factor in the development of nations. Sir Henry Howorth’s

five volumes are practically studies in the influence of the Christian Church upon national institutions; and Canon Scott Holmes' Birkbeck Lectures deal with the same influence in the history of France. It is interesting to compare the stories of the two countries. The position which Christian organisation occupies in English life to-day is very different from that which it occupies in France. Briefly speaking, we may say that Christian organisation is a real, national power in Britain, while in France, whatever the nature of its influence, it failed to be reckoned as a power truly national. The future may be different; the friends of Christianity who are also friends of France sincerely hope that it may. The war, it seems to me, opens a new and great opportunity to the Church in France to reoccupy a position of which mistaken politics and a mistaken Catholicism have deprived it. The patriotic valour and unstinted heroism with which priests have fought in the ranks of the army, offering for their country's sake their sacrifice as simple citizens of France, has drawn laymen and clericals nearer together. Anti-clerical antagonism will be robbed of its bitterness; ecclesiastical feeling will become more saturated with patriotic emotion; ultramontane proclivities will be lessened in the ranks of the clergy. The opportunity of reclaiming her lawful national position is almost within reach, if a large wisdom could direct the hearts of the statesmen and clergy of France.

As matters have been, France has lost in many ways. There has been a lack of homogeneity in her national life by reason of the antagonism in Church and State. The same antagonism has cramped and crippled her literature. Her historians have been partial, prejudiced and incomplete. M. Sabatier lamented, as we have seen, the loss entailed upon French thought by this antagonism of prejudice. He is supported in his view by Canon Scott Holmes, whose anxiety to be just is almost painfully evident in his work, but who nevertheless is constrained to say (p. vi) that the majority of 'French writers are cramped and restrained by their desire to accommodate their investigations to the exigency of modern Papal claims.' The French Church owes something to the robust, business-like and organising powers of Rome; but, when once this is conceded, we are tempted to ask

whether the benefits thus received were sufficient to compensate for the loss of freedom in the disappearance of Gallican liberties, and whether any genuine concord can exist between the Church in France and an organisation which, while pretending to uphold the ideals of moral right, failed to denounce the political perjury and moral outrage of which Belgium was the victim. We are ready to admit the virtue of silence in matters which are not our business, but truth and right are the business of every man, and especially of those who claim to be the official guardians of morals.

The experience of the war may clarify men's thoughts, and lead them to distinguish between Catholicism and Catholicity, as they do between the claims of nationalism and those of nationality. The difference of spirit, which has been set out with clearness by Dr Holland Rose, has been pregnantly expressed by M. Phil. Monier in his book on the Quattrocento. There is all the difference in the world between the people who say 'Nous' and those who say 'Nous seuls'; the first express the rights of nationality, the second announce the ambition of nationalism. A similar distinction might well be recognised between the Catholicity which every Church desires and the Catholicism which would reduce Christendom to a dull uniformity, and give organisation a permanent ascendancy over life.

The study of Church history possesses, then, some real value in helping us to meet the problems of to-day; and M. Paul Sabatier may be right in thinking that such study in France may discover the way by which disputes respecting religious education may be settled. To ignore the part played by religion in the building up of French nationality is to falsify history; to study it will enable Frenchmen to understand the story of their country. They will realise that religion has been a real force in the past. Wise and patriotic hearts are asking in England and in France whether it is just or prudent to ignore it as a power in the future development of the nation; and a thoughtful French writer sees in the radical religionism of the English realistic romance the secret power which made its appeal to the heart of Russia and inspired the genius of its recent novelists. Religious ideas, even when divorced from conventional dogmatism, still exert a deep,

though undefined, influence over national life and literature. It is the constant and vain hope of the secularist that he can preserve the river which irrigates the meadows, after he has cut off the springs in the watershed; it is against this empty and mischievous policy that prudent and aspiring patriots will protest.

It is true that, as we read stories and descriptions of the early Church, our common sense revolts against the crude superstitions which intermingle with genuine religious teaching. We resent the odd admixture of magical formulæ with Christian ideas; we are tempted to treat the whole story as valueless and as belonging to the accumulations of rubbish which are well swept away by the practical intelligence of later times. But a little more thought converts our resentment into interested amusement. We realise that the men and women of these times were, in many respects, like children; the important question is not what games they are playing, but what ideas of life and duty they are imbibing, what kind of character they are forming. It is possible that foolish play and foolish thoughts may be of service in building up lives of admirable quality when the children have become men and women. Nay, more, we can afford to teach them fairy tales, which stimulate the fancy but do not spoil the heart; infancy absorbs many dreams which vanish with growing light, but leave behind a sweet hopefulness and innocent trust—a belief in right, and a conviction that, even if truth be hard to win, it is worth fighting for.

The age of which Sir H. Howorth treats was an age of ignorance and superstition. Give some wonder a religious setting, and it becomes a faith-rousing miracle. St Birinus sets out by ship upon his missionary enterprise; the sailors will not turn back for the sacred vessels which the saint has left behind; what matter when supernatural help is at hand? The saint returns to land, walking on the water, recovers the holy vessels, overtakes the boat, and reaches his destination in safety. St Paul had to wait upon opportunity and to depend upon a travelling friend to bring him the cloak and the parchments which he wanted; but the saint of the seventh century has resources which the Apostolic age could not command. It does not diminish our respect for the

miracle to be told that St Birinus was probably an Irishman of the name of Byrne, who left the fame of his missionary labours on the Chiltern Hills and in Ayrshire. Was it prudence or an antipathy of race which led the saint to commence his mission in Wessex without paying heed or homage to the Archbishop of Canterbury?

It is an age of miracles, and it is an age of visions also. Men earnest in spirit read much, and then bring to bear upon their reading a fancy, rendered unwholesomely vivid by prolonged abstinence. Grim images haunt their souls; they take their form from some prophet's picturings; they gain eccentric additions from some current legend. The world is a wicked world; doom hangs over it; the innocent joys of home life are pollutions to the soul. Step by step new sins arise, and new horrors crowd the imagination; there is no wholesome agnosticism to chasten intelligence. Moreover, the illuminated or morbid mind can penetrate future mysteries. The poetry of the prophet becomes the prose of the visionary; no doubt dims his outlook; no critical capacity thwarts or restrains his dogmatism. Saints and sinners, angels and demons, are well understood and clearly defined; there is a materialised devil, as there is a materialised heaven and a materialised hell. Such things, like the fancies of children, are intensely vivid to the minds of monk and nun, recluse or wandering preacher. If an example is wanted, let the story of St Fursey, 'as told by Sir Henry Howorth, be read. It will then be understood that the genius of Dante did not invent his 'Inferno'; he did what genius has done in every age. He took the current notions of his time, the rich accumulated imaginings of many generations, the multitudinous ideas of dreamers and teachers, and he gave them order and coherence. He took the dry bones and made them live; he gathered up the scattered stones and built them into an altar upon which was to glow henceforth the fire of his imperishable ardour; but the material which he used was the ecclesiastical stock-in-trade, the growth of many minds and many centuries.

St Fursey, we are told by Bede, 'was of very noble Scotie blood, but much more noble in mind than in birth.' In early life he read sacred books and practised monastic disciplin ; he built himself a monastery to be

more free to pursue heavenly studies. He was privileged to see visions; it was reported that he 'fell into a trance during which his soul is supposed to have quitted his body from evening till cock-crow' (I, 104). In one of his visions, which came to him when he was ill, he was caught up to heaven, and saw and heard heavenly things. He saw angels, and heard them sing sweet psalms, foretelling how the saints would go from strength to strength, till every one of them appeared before God. He experienced the conflict between demons and angels, who fought for his soul. The devils began to shoot fiery darts against his soul, but the armed angel shielded him. Then began a controversy between the angels and the demons; both claimed the soul of Furse. The angels expostulated, 'Why hinder us in our journey? This man was no party to your ruin.' The demons replied that Furse had consented to evil and therefore should go to punishment. The fight became furious. Furse had spoken evil words, said the devils; the angels replied that more deadly sins must be proved to justify condemnation. The matter becomes theological. God cannot forgive sins unless the sinner forgives other men. The angel declares that the saint never avenged himself. The devils reply that the scripture requires more than abstention from vengeance; it asks forgiveness from the heart; whereupon the angel aptly retorts that judgment in this matter rests with God.

Another fight ensues in which the angels are victorious. Then the angel shows the saint a vision of four fires; the first of which will burn those who loved 'leasing'; the second, the covetous; the third, the quarrelsome; the fourth, the fraudulent. The four fires were united as one continuous fire. Furse sees that the fires draw near him and he is afraid. The angel then assures him that the fires cannot burn those in whose souls the fire of sins has not been kindled. 'As everyone burns in the body through unlawful lusts, so, when discharged from the body, the soul shall burn in the degree which it has deserved.' The angels who escort the saint protect him in the fire. One cleaves for him a pathway through it; two others on either side defend him from the flames. Again the devils enter upon controversy; they accuse the saint of faults, of

deficiency in love, of failing to rebuke sin; but the demons are put to confusion. A great brightness breaks upon the saint's vision; he is encompassed by angel hosts; the souls of the holy draw near him; the terror of the fire falls away from him. He is in a serene heaven; great light shines through the heights around him; and four companies of angels sing 'Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth.' The vision ended, Fursey returns to earth and resumes his body, having learned much of his own sinfulness.

The germ of true spiritual conceptions may be found amid the grotesque picturings of these visions. The spirit of man, even in its most foolish imaginings, reveals something of its nobler nature. Like the folk-lore legends of all nations, these dreams show how the soul of man gropes after truth. However childish such dreams may seem, they are never insignificant when they are sincere; and, as a rule, the visions of the monks of this age possess at least the mark of sincerity.

In the midst of legends and myths, national life was growing; certain foundations were being laid. Many mistakes were made; time was lost; and confusions followed when mistakes were being corrected, for the growth of national life leaves many ruins behind. Great ideas inspired great structures, but later experience proved them to be impracticable. Men of strong imagination dreamed some dream of far-reaching, perhaps universal order, but their dreams remained, like outlived follies or dismantled abbeys, splendid warnings to later ages. Men are always dreaming of an organisation of human affairs which will ensure human harmony. Their efforts, like those in the plains of Shinar, fail to reach heaven, and usually leave another Babel to mark their failure. Instead of indulging universal fancies, it is wiser to mark the path which the story of the past has marked out and to follow it. That path leads, I have no doubt, to universal harmony; but it leads us first of all to nationality. It is in the vigour and free completeness of national life that we shall find the right road to world-wide order; it is in the independence and free variety of national Churches that we shall strike the road to the reunion of Christendom. Vaticanism, like

Prussianism, is the enemy of true union, for it seeks to put the yoke of the Church upon the necks of others. Nationalism makes nationality elsewhere impossible; the Catholicism of the Curia destroys true Catholicity.

Canon Scott Holmes, whose careful and laborious work adds another regret to the sense of loss occasioned by his early death, has traced the subtleties with which Roman ascendancy first beguiled and then betrayed religious freedom. He describes the way in which the first recognition of Roman authority took place. Rome took advantage of the discords elsewhere, and, posing as peacemaker, prepared the way for the claims which afterwards robbed the Gallican Church of her liberties. It is well to note the slow and subtle shifting of the ground of Roman influence. Her great position as the metropolis of the world gave Rome a natural advantage. What was fashionable in Rome, authorised by Roman custom or Roman Law, seemed to carry with it something of the fascination which belongs to the majesty of the once imperial city. The political and social greatness of Rome dominated the provincial mind; the ascendancy of Rome was natural, because Rome was great in population, in riches and in governing power. In such times 'an episcopal see derived its importance from the civil position of the town' (p. 363). This is intelligible; but there came a time when the Bishop of Rome needed credentials of a more abiding character. Riches were proverbially fleeting; population might decline, and the seat of empire might pass away.

A dispute in France offered an opportunity which Papal ambition was ready to seize. It is significant that discord respecting church organisation provided this opportunity, and brought about a close relationship with the Roman See. The bishops in towns of importance exercised influence, and in some degree authority, over the bishops of smaller places; in this way the Bishop of Vienne had a measure of authority over the province which extended from Vienne and Geneva to Arles, and cut off the province of Narbonensis Prima, which reached from Toulouse to Nîmes, from the province of Narbonensis Secunda, over which the Bishop of Marseilles exercised some kind of supervision. But Arles possessed a measure of historic prestige; it had become in 400 A.D. the official capital of Gaul. As the centre of government

it gave to its bishop an importance and precedence which could not be ignored. Patroclus, the Bishop of Arles, was a man of restless ambition; if he could make Arles an archbishopric, he could claim a position greater than Vienne could claim, in spite of its being the capital of seven provinces. Patroclus therefore betook himself to Rome with the view of getting Zosimus, the Bishop of Rome, to lend the weight of his approval to the project. But the plea on which Patroclus rested, namely, the official dignity of Arles, did not appeal to Zosimus, whose mind turned to ecclesiastical claims of another kind than the civil importance of a town. The current talk in Rome was not of her former greatness as the Imperial City; arguments were to be found which would enable the Bishop of Rome to look down upon the dignity of Constantinople. 'The Primacy of St Peter was now the favourite text' (p. 363). To suit his plea to the prevailing fashion, Patroclus must invest Arles with some Apostolic glory. So he apparently invented a legend. Christianity had been brought to Arles by a Roman missionary named Trophimus; this Trophimus, it was declared, was no other than Trophimus the Ephesian, the companion of St Paul. This was enough for Zosimus; the ambition of Patroclus was gratified by the approval of the Roman See; and Arles was given metropolitical rights over Vienne and Narbonne. But trouble arose. The claim of Roman authority was opposed; 'the Church in Gaul was in revolt against the autocratic action of the Bishop of Rome' (p. 365). The story, writes Canon Scott Holmes,

'is of importance as illustrative at once of a valuable chapter in the history of the organisation of the Church in Gaul, and of the growth of Papal authority which was the more unwelcome because of that evident coercive tendency which was due to the secular power conferred on the bishops of Rome by the civil authority.'

If Churches were content to take credit for services rendered, instead of claiming an authority which cramps national development and destroys national liberty, reasonable men would readily concede such claims. No student of Church history will deny that Rome possessed a wonderful and natural gift of organisation; the Roman

Empire developed it, and the Roman Church inherited it. When we confine our attention to the work of organisation, we shall find in France and in England evidences of the vigour and intelligence, as of the great and useful influence, of Rome. The conversion of Britain and Gaul cannot historically be attributed to Rome; the missionaries whose loving zeal made the Gospel known in these countries came from the East, and were reinforced by the saintly men who came from Ireland and Scotland. But it was the hand of Rome which was mainly instrumental in drawing the sporadic work into more settled order; dioceses were formed, archiepiscopal provinces established. The roughly sown lands were divided; well-defined boundaries were made; clear and well-grown hedges marked off holding from holding; an air of cultivation, care and order was seen everywhere, to prove the organising genius of Rome.

In protesting, then, against the autocratic action of Rome, the Gallican bishops were defending freedom, perhaps at the cost of efficiency. The idea of giving to Arles a position of primacy was possibly wise; it was certainly a step towards a more perfect organisation; but the acceptance of Papal direction was a step towards servitude. The resistance to Rome at the time was superficially foolish, but fundamentally wise; the Gallican bishops were wrong in what they refused, but they were right in the grounds on which they refused. The struggle was like the struggle of John Hampden; good grounds for the need of the money demanded might be proved, but to yield to the demand was fatal to freedom. The ambitions of Rome were continually growing; specious pleas in justification were readily put forward. If historical evidence were needed, it could be based upon imperial decrees or grants, for which policy or superstition or both were responsible; if documentary evidence were required, it could be produced, because forgery justified by piety was a virtue. So the process went forward, till at last claims which at first were due to worldly, sordid or unworthy influences came to be regarded as claims whose sanctity was such that it seemed sinful to deny them. Worldly power assumed the garment of sainthood, and even elect souls were deceived, while the rank and file of men obeyed through fear of

an institution which wielded considerable political power on earth and claimed a more tremendous influence beyond the grave.

But this is to anticipate. At the time of which we are speaking the claims of Rome were but adolescent; their full significance was hardly perceived even in Rome; matters were in the stage at which the full drift of human actions was not understood, and at which resistance is more a matter of instinct than of judgment. At such times instinct is at a disadvantage, for it is difficult to justify it, even though the future should abundantly prove it to have been right. It is one of the pathetic truths of life that Wisdom cannot justify herself—she is only justified of her children.

This is just the point at which English and French ecclesiastical histories set up a signpost which shows the parting of the ways. The story of the Church in France is a story in which Ultramontane claims are more and more conceded, till at length the Church became the symbol of a force which was not only not national, but was viewed by the strongest part of the nation as anti-national. This does not mean that the national spirit was silent or completely subservient to the influence of ambitious or dissolute monarchs. It has sometimes been thought that the Gallican liberties were flourished in the eyes of Europe as a token of the autocratic disposition of the monarch who said—'L'État! c'est moi.' But, as has been well said by the Rev. Arthur Galton,

'Gallicanism was not . . . an invention of Louis XIV or of Bossuet, a courtier's theology, designed to match the new absolutism, a theological decoration added to the splendours of Versailles. It is the embodiment and expression of that dislike, even among Churchmen, for those Ultramontane theories against which the French nation has always protested throughout the long course of its history.' \*

The Articles of 1682 were not novelties; they gave voice to the faith that every nation has a right to religious freedom, unembarrassed by foreign interference. They affirmed that the Bishop of Rome had no authority

---

\* Galton, 'Church and State in France,' p. 9.

in temporal affairs; they declared the validity of the decrees of Constance, which the popes sought to set aside or to ignore; they claimed the constitutional rights of the Gallican Church against Papal interference; and they restated the ancient Catholic principle that Papal decisions need the confirmation of the Church's judgment. They were articles of national freedom, a declaration of war against the intrigues of the Jesuits; and in the view of many they were a counterblast against the decrees of the Council of Trent. However this may be, the decrees of Trent were not accepted in France, in spite of the underground efforts of the Cardinal de Lorraine. Court and Parliament refused them; and the Articles of 1682 were felt to be the restatement of the immemorial claim to Gallican liberties. Thus the claim of national right was maintained through the difficulties of the 16th and 17th centuries.

But France lost a great national force when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes denuded her of that great class in whom, perhaps more than any other, the national spirit is strong. Unfortunately, too, the way in which some French Protestants relied upon Geneva for their orders tended to weaken the national spirit. It is never well when the religious centre of gravity lies geographically outside national life. France suffered from a double Ultramontanism, the Ultramontanism of Rome and that of Geneva; and the religious life of the people lost its national character. The cleavage between Church and State became perilous, for it became a cleavage in which religious differences determined men's politics, and laws respecting religion were settled by political aims. There has been enough of this in England, but happily the cleavage of politics has not always followed that of religion, nor has a man's religious belief always directed his politics.

In England matters went differently. The spirit of England sometimes slept, when the exigencies of kings bartered English liberties, or when it was silenced by the foreign swords which restored them to despotic power. But, silent or sleeping, it was not dead; it held on to life till it was strong enough to assert itself and translate the freedom of its ideal into practical reality. In doing so, the people claimed their national life; they

would be rulers in their own house; they would determine their own religious rites and ceremonies, for such things were, as the Prayer Book hath it, 'in their own nature indifferent.' They determined them, therefore, after a fashion suited to national needs; but in prescribing them they 'condemned no other nation'; for they thought it 'convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory.' In words like these we hear the voice of the national spirit, which claims its own freedom and recognises a similar right of freedom in other lands. Here speaks the true Christian spirit, which acknowledges diversities of administration as well as diversities of gift, and sees in them manifestations of that one and the selfsame spirit which divides to every man and every nation severally as he will.

It was thus that the idea of national churches was recognised in England. It is an idea which, I understand, is abhorrent to a certain type of sectarians to-day. Men of this type dream of Catholicism as the path towards union; for union, in their minds, spells uniformity, and uniformity means surrender to Latinism. Not thus will the reunion of Christendom come; it can only come in the frank recognition of divergence, in the same acceptance of varieties, by which the vitality as well as the virility of worship can be preserved. The want in France to-day is the want of a Church which embodies Christian faith in a form natural to the French genius. The Gallican liberties were parted with at a price which robbed the Church of its national character. The restoration of such liberties by the wisdom and intelligence of the French people to-day would be a measure that would bring the spirit of religion and the spirit of patriotism into a noble alliance, and would prove a step along the true road to the reunion of Christendom. The way to world-federation is by the road of free nationality; and the way to Christian union in the world is by the recognition of national varieties in ecclesiastical life.

W. BOYD CARPENTER.

## Art. 4.—BRITISH WRITERS ON THE UNITED STATES. ✓

1. *Travels in the United States, 1798-1802.* By John Davis, 1803.
  2. *Odes and Epistles.* By Thomas Moore, 1806.
  3. *The Sketchbook.* By Washington Irving, 1819-20.
  4. *Domestic Manners of the Americans.* By Mrs Trollope, 1832.
  5. *The American Revolution in our School Text-books.* By Charles Altschul. New York: Doran Co., 1917.
  6. *The American Oxonian.* Vols I-IV, 1914-17.
- And other works.

IN 'The Sketchbook,' Washington Irving lamented a 'literary animosity daily growing up between England and America.' Writers in this country, he said, were 'instilling anger and resentment into the bosom of a youthful nation, to grow with its growth and to strengthen with its strength.' In a postscript to 'Bracebridge Hall' he returned to the theme. He quoted from the 'Quarterly Review' a 'generous text,' which he lamented 'that publication should so often forget':

'There is a sacred bond between us by blood and by language which no circumstances can break. Our literature must always be theirs; and, though their laws are no longer the same as ours, we have the same Bible, and we address one common Father in the same prayer. Nations are too ready to admit that they have natural enemies; why should they be less willing to believe that they have natural friends?'

Irving insisted that the people of the United States were not only the natural but also the conscious and willing friends of the people of Great Britain, but they had 'been rendered morbidly sensitive by the attacks made upon their country by the English press; and their occasional irritability on this subject has been misinterpreted into a settled and unnatural hostility.' The friendship of which Irving spoke was not much more than courtesy, for he was not 'so sanguine as to believe that the two nations are ever to be bound together by any romantic ties of feeling.'

Irving knew this country well. He had been recognised as the first great man of letters that the Republic had produced, and he had many British friends, among them Sir Walter Scott, to whom he had paid (for our pleasure and profit as well as his own) a well-recorded visit at Abbotsford. Of all Americans then living he was probably the most hopeful about the future relations of his country and ours. Other observers were less confident; and, in the year before the 'Sketchbook' was published, John Bristed, an Englishman who had become domiciled in the United States, assured us that 'Delenda est Carthago' was the motto of America with regard to Great Britain, and that the ocean would 'ere long have its waters deeply dyed with American and British blood.' Bristed's belief was the result, not of acute observation of conditions in America, but of an emotional zeal for his adopted country; and events have proved Irving to be the safer prophet. He himself contributed not a little to the realisation of better things than he dared to prophesy.

Irving's indignation at the treatment of his own country and people by some of the English writers of the early years of the 19th century was not without cause. Yet during the American war itself the tone of men of letters had been friendly to the Americans; and Wraxall scarcely exaggerated when he said, in his *Memoirs*, that, with the exception of Johnson and Gibbon, 'all the eminent or shining talents of the country were marshalled in support of the Colonies.' Johnson's defence of his position was so weak that Boswell dared to get the better of him in argument. He was rewarded, a little later in the conversation, by an unusually offensive remark, for which the great man apologised by admitting that it was a revenge for the American discussion, and that he had deferred it 'because, Sir, I had nothing ready. A man cannot strike till he has his weapons.' On another occasion, Johnson's ill-tempered vehemence against the Americans subjected him to a rebuke from Miss Seward, who certainly regarded herself as representing (and did, in this instance, represent) the literary opinion of the time: 'Sir, this is an instance that we are always most violent against those whom we have injured.' Gibbon's silent votes in the House of Commons for what

he described as 'the rights, though not, perhaps, the interest of the mother-country' were determined by his personal relations with Lord North and the Government, all of whose measures he did not approve. There is a third exception, John Wesley, who, like Johnson, wrote a pamphlet in defence of the Government; but Wesley's first impulses—he was apparently converted by Johnson—were on the side of the colonists.

'In spite of all my rooted prejudice,' he told Lord Dartmouth in 1775, 'I cannot avoid thinking (if I think at all) that an oppressed people asked for nothing more than their legal rights, and that in the most modest and inoffensive manner which the nature of the thing would allow' (Hist. MSS. Comm. xi, App. 5, p. 378).

Hume gave point to Johnson's gibe that 'he was a Tory by chance' by agreeing with Burke and Chatham, and he foretold the success of the Americans (Hill Burton's 'Hume,' ii, p. 482). Soldiers, like Lord Balcarres, who took part in the war, acknowledged 'the great fundamental points of military institution—sobriety, subordination, regularity, and courage,' which had produced the American victory. Nor, though the evidence is scarcely relevant to purely literary opinion, should it be forgotten that, when the war was over and the American cause had triumphed, the King in his first interview with the Envoy of the Republic, acknowledging the agitation of his feelings, had, in brave and manly words, assured the Ambassador that, as he had been the last man in Great Britain to admit the independence of his American Dominions, he would likewise be the last to infringe it.

There never has been any change in the attitude of our great writers towards the American people; and the books of which Irving complained were the work of men who, with one exception, had little claim to distinction. 'It has been the peculiar lot of our country,' he wrote, 'to be visited by the worst kind of English travellers.' A brief survey of some of their productions will show that the words were not unjustified. The worst of all these ignoble books was 'Travels in the United States, 1798-1802,' by John Davis (published in 1803). It was

dedicated by permission to President Jefferson and contained a letter from him to the author, and it thus attracted much more attention than it deserved.

Davis had wandered through parts of the United States, making a precarious living as a tutor; his book was full of painful efforts at wit and of exercises in the sentimentalism which was characteristic of the period, and it was grossly offensive to the Americans. It was followed in 1805 by Richard Parkinson's 'Tour in America in 1798-1800,' which, though a more respectable production than its predecessor, was also the work of an unsuccessful adventurer, who missed the comforts of the old country, resented his failure to make his way in the new, and avenged himself by scurrilous attacks upon a people who had not appreciated him. Another unlucky speculator, Charles William Janson, who had been, among other things, a briefless barrister in Rhode Island, likewise vented his wrath upon the manners and morals of the people of the United States ('The Stranger in America,' 1807). H. B. Fearon's 'Narrative' (1818) professed a profound admiration for George Washington; but the writer found that there was little scope for himself and his friends in the States, and he took the opportunity of indulging in many disagreeable and frequently silly reflections upon the American people. An equally bitter tone pervades Thomas Ashe's 'Travels in America' (1809). These men are all unknown to fame, and the Americans may have resented more deeply the 'Odes and Epistles' (1806) of Tom Moore, who had made a journey through the States. 'How far I was right in assuming the tone of a satirist against a people whom I viewed but as a stranger and a visitor, is a doubt which my feelings did not allow me to investigate,' he says in his Preface. He had nothing but scorn for the 'bastard Freedom' of the United States, and he foretold their 'slow and cold stagnation into vice':

"Tis one dull chaos, one unfertile strife  
Betwixt half-polish'd and half-barbarous life."

Irving's protest did not put an end to the foolish and trivial criticisms of American manners which had rendered such books irritating to the Americans. Adlard Welby ('Visit to North America,' 1821) found 'a most

unconciliating manner of studiously avoiding common civility,' and expressed grave doubts of the possession by the American people of 'the very essential Christian principle of goodwill and benevolence.' Thomas Hamilton's 'Men and Manners in America' (1833), and Captain Marryat's 'Diary in America' (1839) were productive of further and not unnatural irritation. It would be useless to pursue these publications further, but a few words must be said about three books which provoked much controversy.

Captain Basil Hall, R.N., a distinguished traveller in many lands, who visited Scott at Abbotsford, published in 1829 a volume of 'Travels in North America.' He had undertaken the tour in the hope of writing a book which would help to reconcile the two nations, but he came to the conclusion that of 'the spirit of generous rivalry and cordial international respect there are but feeble traces in our relations with America, and not the slightest spark in theirs with us.' The two peoples, he thought, had a 'mutual hostility'; and he expressed himself very freely about American manners and customs. The indignation aroused by his book was revived by Mrs Trollope's 'Domestic Manners of the Americans' (1832). Emigration to America had failed to satisfy Mrs Trollope's hopes, and she frankly confessed: 'I do not like them, I do not like their principles, I do not like their manners, I do not like their opinions.' [Her narrative makes it equally clear that the Americans did not like Mrs Trollope. A clever satirical writer, she produced a book which had a wide circulation on both sides of the Atlantic, and did much to poison the intercourse between the two peoples. Captain Hall and Mrs Trollope were probably in Dickens' mind when old Mr Weller gave his son a prescription for raising the costs in *Bardwell v. Pickwick*: 'Let the gov'ner . . . write a book about the 'Merrikins as'll pay all his expenses and more if he blows 'em up enough.' By the irony of fate, Dickens himself soon became involved in a somewhat similar controversy. His criticisms on America were more reasonable and much less trivial than Mrs Trollope's, and the popularity of their author in America gave them the sharpness of the wounds of a friend. It is unnecessary to enter into the controversy, and we shall content ourselves with

quoting the comment of Leslie Stephen in the 'Dictionary of National Biography': 'The Americans were still provincial enough to fancy that the first impressions of a young novelist were really of importance.'

There is plenty of evidence, besides Irving's, about the effect of these publications. J. R. Godley, in his 'Letters from America' (1844), lamented the tone of English travellers. At Baltimore, in November 1842, he had seen 'every one reading Dickens' Notes and most people exceedingly angry.' He attributed the circumstance that 'the masses in America look with a far more friendly feeling upon France than upon England,' at all events in part, to the writings of De Tocqueville and Chevalier. Yet there were many travellers from the old country who wrote with appreciation and even with enthusiasm of the United States. John Palmer's 'Journal' (1817), John Bradbury's 'Travels' (1817), John M. Duncan's 'Travels' (1823), Adam Hodgson's 'Letters' (1824), 'An English Gentleman's Excursion' (1824), were all courteous and frequently laudatory. Morris Birkbeck's 'Notes on America' (1818) were written with the admiration of a new settler; William Tell Harris's 'Remarks made during a Tour' (1821) and 'An Englishwoman's View of Society and Manners in America' (1821) showed enthusiasm for American institutions. Francis Hall, a lieutenant in the 14th Light Dragoons, in his 'Travels in Canada and the United States' (1818), protested against the criticism of American manners, recorded that he did not 'meet with a single instance of incivility betwixt Canada and Charleston, except at the Shenandoah Point, from a drunken English deserter,' wrote with enthusiasm of the society he met at Washington, and paid a high tribute to the American army. A much more distinguished writer than any of these, Miss Harriet Martineau ('Society in America,' 1837, and 'Retrospect of Western Travel,' 1838), was prepared, by training and outlook, to be appreciative of the Americans and their institutions; and the many pages in which she recorded her impressions cannot have disappointed their expectations. She found them both the wisest and the wittiest of nations.

Not only is there, as we see, a cloud of witnesses on the other side of the controversy, but the books which

asserted an insolent superiority in treating of things American were subjected to very severe criticism in this country. The 'Edinburgh Review' dwelt upon the incredibility of the supposition that the condition of the United States 'has ever been so deplorable as to form a proper object for the contempt of Mr Davis'; and it dealt equally severely with Parkinson, Ashe, and Janson, and referred contemptuously to both the politics and the poetry of Moore's lucubrations. In dealing with Basil Hall, the same periodical protested against an array of trivial charges—'we can surely let them eat their dinners, although somewhat faster than we can well follow'—and added that the remarks about spitting suggested a belief that no English gentleman had spat since the Heptarchy. Mrs Trollope's cleverness, and the fact that her American experiences had converted her to Toryism, delighted Lockhart in the 'Quarterly'; but the 'Edinburgh' subjected her book to a severe criticism, largely on the score of bad taste, and asserted that she had given the Americans 'as much provocation as the mere channel of private literature can possibly convey.'

It was generally admitted that Americans were unduly sensitive to English criticism; but their very impatience, as Irving and others remarked, proved 'their respect for English opinion and their desire for English amity, for there is never jealousy where there is not strong regard.' There were, however, more serious explanations, both of the criticisms themselves and of the sensitiveness with which they were received, than mere irritation at American manners on the one hand and at English superiority on the other. Some British travellers in the States had personal grievances, real or imaginary, against individual Americans, and their resentment took the form of insults to America; but it is more important to notice the conditions, alike in British and in American politics, which profoundly affected both the attacks upon America and the attitude of Americans to these attacks. Admiration for American institutions, and for the American people, became, unfortunately, almost a test of party feeling in Great Britain. So early as 1805, Benjamin Silliman, an American traveller, noticed that in this country there were men 'whose admiration of America knows no bounds, whose language

concerning us is always that of extravagant encomium, and who heap odium upon their own country in proportion as they exaggerate the advantages of ours,' and that there were others, again, who could find no good in a Republic.

A comparison of the pages of the 'Edinburgh Review,' with those of the 'Quarterly Review,' in dealing with the books we have been describing, shows how intimately the discussion even of American manners and customs was connected with the political prejudices of the writers. The Tory found American institutions intolerable; the Whig regarded them with sympathy; the Radical used them as ammunition for attacks upon conditions at home. There was a further complication in the state of political affairs in America. Every British traveller, Whig, Tory, or Radical, expressed horror at the existence of slavery in the United States, and very few took any pains to moderate the expression of their horror. The friends of America in the British press never failed to insist upon this important qualification of their admiration for the Republic. The American conscience was not clear on the subject; and the constant repetition of British condemnation was correspondingly irritating. Until the emancipation of slaves in the British colonies, there was a 'tu quoque' argument; and Americans did not fail to remember it when, for example, Sydney Smith wrote in the 'Edinburgh Review' of 1824:

'On the subject of slavery, the conduct of America is, and has been, most reprehensible. It is impossible to speak of it with too much indignation and contempt; but for it, we should look forward with unqualified pleasure to such a land of freedom, and such a magnificent spectacle of human happiness.'

This retort ceased to be available, and the Americans found another reply to British sermons on slavery. They remembered the arguments about the condition of the lower classes in this country, and the contrast with their happier contemporaries in America, on which Whig and Radical travellers had laid great emphasis; and they came to the conclusion that that condition was so bad that reproaches directed against slavery in America were only

so many fresh proofs of our national hypocrisy. Cobbett's 'Year's Residence in the United States of America' (1819), though marked by its writer's all-embracing pugnacity, is in the main a contrast between the two countries, designed to aid reform at home. He relates an anecdote which illustrates the effect of his own teaching upon American opinion. An old Loyalist once said to him: 'Well, Mr Cobbett, I confess that I was always for King George during our Revolutionary War, but I believe all was for the best, for, if I had had my wishes, he might have treated us as he now treats the people of England.' Cobbett's explanation of the iniquities of the 'borough-mongers' relieved the poor old King of the responsibility, but did not modify the general impression of English institutions; and those who are familiar with his vigorous and racy style and with the violence of his statements will realise how profound that impression must have been.

We know, from the evidence of many observers, how keenly Americans watched the course of political controversy in this country; and they found much to confirm what Cobbett and others had taught them about the poorer classes in Great Britain. Godley, in 1844, found the statesmen and wealthy classes friendly, but lamented that 'the popular mind feeds on absurd and exaggerated accounts of the miserable and enslaved state of the lower classes in England, and of the pride and privileges of the aristocracy.' Sir Charles Lyell, in his 'Second Visit to the United States' (1849), was told that a great effect had been produced in America by 'the letters lately published by Mr Colman on English Agriculture, in which the poverty, ignorance, and stationary condition of the British peasantry are painted in most vivid colours'; and that Lord Shaftesbury's speeches 'on the miseries endured by women and boys in coal-mines, factories, etc.,' had also deeply impressed American readers. British horror of slavery was heartfelt and genuine, but, in other ways, our own hands were not clean; and it was in vain that our critics pointed out the essential difference between slavery and the condition of a labourer or a factory hand in this country. We were condemned out of our own mouths; and the Americans, convincing themselves that the

peasant in Great Britain was less happy than the slave in America, resented—whatever their own attitude to slavery might be—the tone adopted by British writers in discussing the question of abolition. The wonder, indeed, is that our critical travellers did not do more harm than they actually did; and it is pleasant to find that Professor Daubeny, of Oxford, who printed for private circulation in 1843 a 'Journal of a Tour through the United States and Canada' (made in 1837-8), was impressed by the 'assurances of attachment to England' which he received and by the friendly discussions which he heard everywhere about 'Brougham, Canning, Melbourne, and the little Queen.'

If the travellers were often insulting in their tone towards America, a corrective could be found not only in English reviews of their productions, but also in many incidental remarks scattered through the writings of our great poets and men of letters. Wordsworth, in 'Ruth,' described the youth from Georgia as having fought for the colonists and as coming to England 'when America was free'; and in the Tract on the Convention of Cintra he said: 'In the course of the last thirty years, we have seen two wars waged against Liberty—the American war, and the war against the French people in the early stages of their Revolution.' He censured the 'presumptuous irreverence of the principles of justice, and blank insensibility to the affections of human nature, which determined the conduct of our government,' and he praised the American spirit of resistance, 'subtle, ethereal, mighty, incalculable.' Shelley in the 'Revolt of Islam' (1818) described America as the home of freedom:

'Yes, in the desert there is built a home  
For Freedom. Genius is made strong to rear  
The monuments of man beneath the dome  
Of a new heaven; myriads assemble there  
Whom the proud lords of man, in rage or fear,  
Drive from their wasted homes.'

Southey, who wrote the 'Quarterly' article from which Irving quoted, composed, during the war of 1812-1814, an Ode in which he attacked not the people of the United

States but the rulers who afflicted with their misrule the  
indignant land

‘Where Washington hath left  
His awful memory  
A light for after times;’

and he prophesied their repudiation by their own countrymen. Byron, in his ‘Ode on Venice’ (1818), wrote a eulogy on America, whose people were ‘nursed in the devotion of Freedom,’ which their fathers had fought for and bequeathed. Coleridge, who, like other people in this country, was intensely irritated by the ‘shallowness and vulgar incivility of English visitors to the United States,’ described America in 1829 as ‘Britain with elbow-room and doubly free’:

‘Each heaven-sanctioned tie the same,  
Laws, manners, language, faith, ancestral blood,  
Domestic honour, awe of womanhood.’

Sydney Smith, who, as an investor in Pennsylvanian securities, said some hard things about the repudiation controversy in 1843, was stung by a retort that his letters showed a morbid hatred of America.

‘Hate America!’ he replied, ‘I have loved and honoured America all my life; and in the “Edinburgh Review,” and at all opportunities which my trumpery sphere of action has afforded, I have never ceased to praise and defend the United States.’

In a later generation, Thackeray ‘felt almost as much at home in Broadway as on the Brompton pavement’; and, on the occasion of his second American lecturing tour, was ‘no longer starting for a new world but returning to friends and to familiar associations.’ ‘The Virginians’ (1857-9) was a sequel to this visit and to the ‘Four Georges,’ who made their first appearance on American platforms. It is difficult to realise what the most devout American critics found to resent in the book; but one of Thackeray’s American friends wrote to him, in June 1858: ‘I’ve been fighting for you in papers, etc., for of course you know how you’ve been abused by us for “The Virginians,” and especially the Washington.’ The date

shows that the abuse must have related to the earlier chapters of the novel, which was issued in parts; but we had hitherto believed that George Warrington himself was the only person who disliked the Colonel Washington of the Castlewood days. Even the most perfervid American must have been satisfied with the later passage in which Thackeray, putting his own thoughts into the mouth of a soldier who had fought for King George against the Americans, speaks of the American leader as 'a character to admire and revere, a life without a stain, a fame without a flaw.'

Thackeray naturally leads us to the historians, whose honourable society may claim 'The Virginians' as well as 'The Four Georges'; and, indeed, it is scarcely necessary to enlarge upon the affection for America and the Americans cherished by men of letters of the last generation. One sentence may suffice. 'Since their noble closing of their Civil War, I have looked to them [the Americans] as the hope of our civilisation' (Meredith, 'Letters,' ii, 388). The words have acquired a new significance to-day.

Mr Altschul's survey of the kind of information about the War of Independence which is taught to children in American schools—a most useful investigation which may have far-reaching results—gives fresh point to the question: How have British historians treated the controversy? It must, of course, be admitted that the standpoints of historians in this country and in America are necessarily different. Bannockburn is an incident in the history of England, but it is much more than an incident in the history of Scotland; and the year 1776, or the year 1783, must always have a larger place in an American than in a British book. Varying estimates of the relative importance of events cannot but nourish differences in the emotions with which those events are regarded; and Dr Johnson himself would agree that a citizen of the United States 'is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force' by relating the story of his country's freedom. We should therefore expect to find our own accounts of the great quarrel more impartial than those written in America; and, on the whole, the expectation will not be disappointed, though it should be added that, in recent times, American

historians have rivalled our own writers both in the determination to be just and in the desire to be generous.

It would not help our investigation to examine such works as John Andrews' 'History of the War with America, France, Spain, and Holland' (1785-6), published immediately after the cessation of hostilities, or the careful, and, in some respects, still authoritative 'History of the American War' (1794), by Charles Stedman, an American Loyalist who had been an officer in Howe's army. The first general historian to treat the subject was John Adolphus. He was born in 1768, and was therefore fifteen years old at the time of the Peace of Versailles; and he published in 1802 three volumes on the 'History of England from 1760 to 1783.' Adolphus lived too near the events to avoid all traces of bitter feeling, but his general attitude is expressed in one of his early remarks about the opposition to the Stamp Act:

'The inhabitants of great part of North America were strongly imbued with the spirit of liberty which characterises the natives of Britain, from whom they derived their origin, and with that jealous irritability which is the companion and best guard of uncontaminated freedom.'

Adolphus' sympathies were modified by his insistence on the strictly legal position and by his dependence on Stedman's book. He himself shared the opinion of Josiah Tucker that, as 'the expense of the contest would more than countervail all the advantages to be derived from an enforced and sullen submission,' it would have been best to grant independence at once; and he described Tucker's advice as 'no less wise than noble,' but 'utterly impracticable in a deliberative government.' He resented the execution of André and other incidents in the war; but the American reader may be satisfied with the words in which an Englishman, writing in 1802, spoke of General Washington:

'Perhaps no personal character ever stood on a more elevated point of view than that of Washington at this period [1783]. The triumph of the American cause was justly attributed to his perseverance, prudence, and judgment; and his self-denial formed a noble and dignified example, rarely paralleled.'

Lord Stanhope's 'History of England from the Peace of Utrecht' (1836-63), written from a Whig standpoint, definitely adopted the American cause:

'Happy (he says) had it been for England if the views of her Ministers at that period had expanded with her territory, and led them to treat their distant settlers not as lonely dependants, but rather as fellow-subjects and as freemen! Happy had they refrained from measures of aggression which—rashly urged in council, but feebly supported in war—have converted many once loyal and contented provinces into a rival empire!'

Macaulay, in reviewing Southey's 'Colloquies,' took the opportunity of remarking that Southey

'never speaks of the people of the United States with that pitiful affectation of contempt by which some members of his party have done more than wars or tariffs can do to excite mutual enmity between two communities formed for mutual friendship.'

Sir George Trevelyan, in his 'Early History of Charles James Fox' (1880) and in more recent works, has been more American than most recent Americans in his denunciation of the policy of the British Government. The 'Early History of Charles James Fox' appeared before the volumes of Mr Lecky's 'History of England in the 18th Century' (1878-1890) which treated of the American War; and, though Mr Lecky's object was to present what he regarded as a more balanced view than that of Sir George Trevelyan, his sympathy with essential points in the American contention was clearly expressed. Most important of all for the formation of general opinion were Macaulay's 'Essays' and J. R. Green's 'Short History,' for these books have, more than any others, influenced the writers of historical text-books, and, through them, successive generations of school children and young students. It is largely owing to the influence of Macaulay that we can say that, for at least fifty years, we have taught in our schools that the disasters of the years 1776-1783 were the deserved and inevitable results of an unwise policy; and that, whatever may be said from a purely legal or technical standpoint, our cause, in our quarrel with the Americans, was,

in the broad issues which alone are decisive in such a question, not a righteous cause.

This is the faith in which we and our fathers have been nurtured; and this early teaching explains no small part of the friendly feeling which we have entertained for our American kinsfolk since we can remember anything at all. 'They never pardon who have done the wrong' is not an invariable rule of human history. Even the few text-books which have taken a different line have done so with very emphatic reservations, and have conceded that in George Washington the Americans possess one of the great men of all times. 'In truth,' concludes one of these books, 'the best laurels reaped in this unsatisfactory contest were those which adorned the brow of George Washington.' Washington has been, for generations, a hero of British as well as of American boyhood; and those of us who were children when the Civil War had recently closed were taught a not less reverent admiration for Lincoln. Many of us were brought up on the books which described the careers of Lincoln's great associates; and 'From Log Cabin to White House' or 'From Tan Yard to White House' could be found in our small collections of treasured books.

In 1831, Washington Irving received an honorary degree from the University of Oxford, the first American to be enrolled among Oxford doctors. In 1902, the will of Cecil Rhodes multiplied a thousandfold the already numerous links between Oxford and the United States, links which are pleasantly recorded by the periodical publication, 'The American Oxonian,' mentioned at the head of this paper. The foundation of the American Rhodes Scholarships, which in the last fifteen years have made so many Anglo-American friendships, was a happy celebration of the unbroken sympathy which has existed, through all the changes and chances of political affairs, between the men of letters of this country and our American kinsfolk, from the days of Scott and Irving to those of Lowell, Tom Hughes, Leslie Stephen, and Lord Bryce.

ROBERT S. RAIT.

Art. 5.—HOW GERMANY TREATS THE NATIVE.

1. *Reichstag: Stenographische Berichte.* (Reports of Debates.) Norddeutsche Buchdruckerei.
2. *Complaints of the Akwa Chiefs.* (Reichstag, Aktenstücke, No. 323, vol. 241.) Norddeutsche Buchdruckerei.
3. *Die Wahrheit über die Heidenmission und ihre Gegner.* Von J. Scholze. Berlin: Süsserott, 1905.
4. *Die Herero: ein Beitrag zur Landes- Volks- und Missions-Kunde.* Von Missionär F. Irle. Gütersloh: Bortelsmann, 1906.
5. *Elf Jahre Gouverneur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika.* Von Theodor Leutwein, General-Major und Gouverneur, 3. D. Berlin; Mittler, 1906.
6. *Geschichtliche und kulturelle Entwicklung unserer Schutzgebiete.* Von J. K. Vietor. Berlin: Reimer, 1913.
7. *The Germans and Africa.* By Evans Lewin. With an Introduction by Earl Grey. Cassell, 1915.
8. *Germany's vanishing Colonies.* By Gordon Le Sueur. London: Everett, 1915.
9. *L'Expansion allemande hors d'Europe.* Par E. Tonnelat. Paris: Armand Colin, 1908.

AFTER alluding, in the preface to his book on German South-West Africa, to the 'faults and mistakes of the past,' General Leutwein says significantly, 'Let us learn in the first instance from both that, despite the higher position of the colonising race, the aim of a colonial policy on large lines must be the incorporation of the original people found in the acquired lands, and not their forcible oppression, still less their annihilation.' Though expressed with inevitable reserve, it would be impossible to find a truer or more forcible impeachment of the German colonial policy. Leutwein saw things as they really were, but was hampered and thwarted by Prussian ruthlessness. He believed in conciliating the natives and treating them fairly, and was convinced that the Herero rising could have been stopped after Waterberg; and that, when sufficient punishment had been meted out, wisdom as well as humanity suggested proffering reconciliation. His military successor, General von Trotha, a typical Prussian, held

quite other views, as evinced in his cruel and bombastic proclamation of Oct. 2, 1904.

'The Herero nation must now leave the country. If the people do not leave, I will compel them with the big tube. Within the German frontier every Herero, with or without a rifle, with or without cattle, will be shot. I will not take over any more women or children, but I will either drive them back to your people or have them fired on. These are my words to the nation of the Hereros.

'The great General of the Mighty Emperor,  
'VON TROTHA.'

Though Leutwein would never have issued so brutal a proclamation, he was sufficiently imbued with the Prussian spirit of unscrupulousness, which holds that the end justifies the means, to reiterate constantly that, as there lacked troops to subdue the natives by force, it was justifiable, indeed praiseworthy, to take advantage of racial jealousies and differences, in order to incite the tribes to mutual extermination. That such was the opinion of a comparatively humane man, makes it possible to believe what, though well authenticated, is an otherwise almost incredible record of butchery and atrocities. Every item of evidence produced in this article has been carefully sifted; and for every crime recorded further evidence could be produced. We prefer to let the Germans be in the main their own accusers.

The idea of colonisation was strange to most Germans thirty years ago, and almost universally unpopular. Economic prosperity had increased; no outlet for a surplus-population was needed; military ambition suggested keeping the man-power at home; and Bismarck had expressed himself, in almost scathing terms, as opposed on patriotic grounds to emigration. Gradually, however, colonisation came to be officially recognised as necessary to a rapacious *Weltpolitik*. There was comparatively little thought of making the colonies homes for settlers. With the exception of certain parts of South-West Africa, the climate of the Protectorates was suited only for independent native labour or for coloured labour under the direction of white men; and a census of immigrants shows that, even after thirty years of colonisation, the percentage of Europeans was

small. Briefly, Germany's object in colonisation was to do good business. Had this been carried out justly and equitably, no one could have complained; but *Schrecklichkeit* was used persistently as the weapon to subjugate the natives, and the men sent to wield it were mostly failures, or worse—'abgelebt' (men who have lived), as one of their countrymen has called them. It seems scarcely necessary to dwell on the infamy of sending such men as representatives of European civilisation and the Christian standard to peoples in the childhood of knowledge.

The Social Democrats were always outspoken in the Reichstag, but criticisms of the policy pursued were by no means limited to them. Prince Hohenlohe, speaking for the Colonial Department on March 13, 1906, said :

'Faults have been committed. The Governor of East Africa has directly acknowledged it. He has confessed that such faults have happened in East Africa under his administration. . . . He has expressed his doubts whether the hut tax as it stands, as also the so-called forced labour, are legitimate measures.'

On November 28, 1906, Dr Schaedler called the story of the colonies one of

'embezzlements, falsifyings, sensual cruelties, assaults on women, horrible ill-treatment—things that do not serve to make a laurel wreath'; and he added that 'officials and officers who stink materially and morally are no good to us in the Colonies, not even if they were royal princes, but could only be suited to drag the German, and I would add the Christian, name in the dust.'

Many similar opinions could be cited. It was also proved that in East Africa and the Cameroons German officials taught the natives an immorality hitherto unknown to them, disregarded their feelings by taking their wives and *fiancées* to satisfy their own passions, and built houses at the expense of the State for the accommodation of their copious female retinue.

The cases of the notorious Dr Karl Peters, of Wehlan, and of Leist were commented on in their day by the press, and are therefore given here only in general outline. They are representative of the brutality, debauchery,

and sensuality which stain German colonial administration. Peters was lauded to the skies by his admirers as a progressive pioneer of colonial expansion; his own writings reveal him as unscrupulous, a plunderer and utterly inhuman—a self-revelation fully borne out by other testimony. The explorer Scavenius, after following in his steps near the Tana river, says:

‘On every side I came on traces of war. In the neighbourhood of Obangi I found eleven villages that had been destroyed by fire, and everywhere skeletons of men, women and children,\* those of women and children being especially numerous.’

The perpetrator was Peters,† while ostensibly conducting an expedition for the relief of Emin Pasha, but really intent on furthering German interests in Uganda and also on acquiring vast territories for himself as ‘Supreme Lord.’ For his services he was sent in 1891 as Imperial Commissioner to East Africa, where his crimes were so heinous that the most daring official whitewashing could not hide their blackness. The climax was reached when Peters hanged his young servant Mabruk, ostensibly for stealing cigarettes, really because he had visited a native girl with whom Peters was himself on terms of intimacy. The girl was repeatedly flogged and finally hanged.

Peters was tried before a disciplinary court and dismissed the service, not for his atrocities, but for having lied to his superiors. He appealed to the Supreme Court at Leipzig, which confirmed the dismissal, condemning him to payment of all costs. Part of the trial was heard *in camera*, because of the nature of the self-revelations he had made to the Austrian Consul-General at Zanzibar, who offered his evidence. And yet Peters’ partisans were not satisfied, but appealed to the Kaiser, with the result that he was partially rehabilitated and received back his title of Imperial Commissioner. It is only fair to say that honest men in Germany, of both the Centre and the Socialist parties, spoke out boldly and repeatedly on the Peters’ case. Deputy Dr Lieber, the leader of the

---

\* Peters owned to shooting every native he came across and pouring petroleum on every hut and setting fire to it.

† For other details see Lewin’s ‘Germans and Africa,’ and Peters’ own work: ‘New Light on Dark Africa.’ †

Centre, declared that Peters had been dismissed 'for the most unclean things an official could do.' Despite of this, Geheimrat von Hellwig, who conducted the prosecution, was forced to retire on a pension; and Dr Kayser, the Director of the Colonial Department, according to the statement of his widow, was threatened on his sick bed by the Conservative member Dr Arendt. General von Liebert, an ex-governor of German East Africa and President of the Anti-Socialist League, put the crown on official disregard of righteousness, by declaring that 'in Africa it was impossible to get on without cruelty,' and by calling Peters' condemnation 'a judicial murder.' Such were the forces at work to uphold the unworthy instruments of German colonial policy.

In regard to Herr Wehlan, an official of the Cameroons, it was said by a deputy, that he tumbled upstairs rather than down, being appointed, out of his turn, to a post as notary in Berlin, after having been found out. The charge against Wehlan was that of having grossly abused his authority, of treating the natives with the most revolting cruelty, and flogging and executing them on the most trivial pretexts. At the first trial he was fined 25*l.* and was removed to another but no less important post. Once more public opinion found expression in the press and the Reichstag; and the case was referred to Leipzig, where the original verdict was confirmed.

At the end of December 1894, about a hundred native soldiers, mostly from Dahomey, who were employed in the Cameroons, made their way to Government House, where the officials were at dinner. They shot the Judge, who was seated at the head of the table, probably mistaking him for Deputy-Governor Leist, who had caused twenty of the men's wives to be publicly flogged for laziness. The mutineers then took possession of the town; the European merchants and traders sought refuge on the British and African Company's steamers; and the German officials fled to German gun-boats anchored in the river. Reinforcements quelled the mutiny; and two men and three women, who gave themselves up, were hanged. The soldiers' wives were flogged with a rhinoceros-hide whip, while the deputy-governor looked on; and soldiers were drawn up in parade order, to gaze on the revolting spectacle. Prince Arenberg had

the manliness to say in the Reichstag on Feb. 9, 1894, that Herr Leist had by this act 'polluted the name of Germany.' On Oct. 16, Leist was arraigned before the Disciplinary Court at Potsdam, charged not only with having had the women stripped and flogged, but (as described in the Reichstag) with having caused 'the women who had been pledged by the niggers for their debts to be brought to him from the Imperial "pawnshop" to brighten his hours of leisure'! Herr Rose, the prosecuting counsel, sent to the Cameroons on behalf of the Colonial Department to investigate the case, demanded Leist's dismissal from the Service. The Court found that he had not exceeded in the matter of the flogging, and that his conduct had not caused the mutiny, though the charges were not disputed. The 'Kreuz Zeitung' and other officially inspired organs of the press tried to make the best of a bad case; but the public took the matter up, and the Foreign Office appealed to the Supreme Court at Leipzig. Hereupon Leist was dismissed the Service and condemned in costs, the Higher Court taking the view that he had lowered German prestige.

The atrocities committed by Peters were exceeded by another German officer. On a punitive expedition against the Bahoho, who declined German protection, Lieut. Dominik attacked a village near the Nachtigal Falls on the River Sunague, and massacred the whole adult population. A number of little children, quoted in the Reichstag as fifty-two, were then placed in baskets, such as the black soldiers weave, and thrown into the rapids. Dominik, when charged with this, pleaded ignorance and the licentious cruelty of his six hundred native troops. Naturally the question suggests itself: Did these children drown without uttering a cry, or are German lieutenants both blind and deaf? Bebel and others could not accept Dominik's explanation, in view of the fact of the atrocious act having been witnessed by one Mr Genke (of Jaunde) and otherwise established. This same Dominik was accused by Bebel on Dec. 1, 1906, of having ordered his men to mutilate the bodies of dead enemies so as to show by their sanguinary trophies how many natives had fallen. That this is undeniable is proved by the British Government complaining of it in 1902 to the German Ambassador in

London, who reported the complaint to Berlin. Hereupon Lieut. Dominik was reprimanded; but the Governor of the Cameroons, von Puttkamer, though cognisant of the mutilation of corpses, was stated to have done nothing till then to check it. Germany honoured Peters and Dominik by erecting statues of them, the first at Dares-Salaam, the other at Jaunde.

The Dominik case recalls a still more disgusting and horrible mutilation, for it was perpetrated on living men. Lieut. Schennemann, the Station-Director at Jaunde in the Cameroons, had married a black wife, and, learning that she preferred the society of three natives, he sent a sergeant to find them, in order to put an effectual stop to their visits. By mistake the sergeant went to the wrong village, but, fearing the consequences if he returned with his orders unfulfilled, seized three strangers and, having mutilated them in the most horrible way, left these human wrecks uncared for by the wayside. The whole story was told openly in the Reichstag.

It is the fashion at the present moment, in certain quarters, to speak of the head of the Catholic party in the Reichstag, Herr Erzberger, as an impostor. That is not the light in which he showed himself regarding colonial scandals, for he always helped to bring them forward and animadverted on them unreservedly. To him and to another member named Ablass it was due that attention was called to the misdeeds of Capt. Thierry, whom they stated to have shot down the natives like game, and to be notorious for his cruelty. From first to last the attitude of the Government was to turn a deaf ear to abuses; and the principle adopted by Dernburg again and again was to make light of bad cases, while the Centre and the National Liberals encouraged the plain speaking of the Social-Democrats.

The publication of the crimes of Capt. Kannenberg was due to Deputies Erzberger, Bebel and Ledebour. Lying in his tent, in the autumn of 1898, at Kongwa in German East Africa, Kannenberg heard a noise and a child crying, which annoyed him. He got up, approached a neighbouring native hut, and putting his gun through the grass wall, fired it more than once. A woman and her child were lying in bed and were injured by the shot. An official enquiry was ordered regarding

his conduct, but no proceedings were taken. On another occasion, he sent for two village chiefs, termed Jumbis, to question them as to the meaning of certain words in their language. They refused to answer, restrained apparently by religious scruples. Furious at their resistance, he ordered them to be flogged, one man receiving seventy-five lashes, the other a hundred. Between each stroke, Kannenberg asked if the Jumbis would give the required reply. The men were then locked up for the night. Groaning in their misery, they were overheard by the sentinel on duty, who rushed in and clubbed one of the men with the butt-end of his gun. The man died that night. This time, Kannenberg was prosecuted, and sentenced to three years' imprisonment and dismissal from the Service, the Court considering that the sentry's blows and not the flogging might have caused the chief's death.

Ere long, Kannenberg's sentence was lightened; he was sent to a fortress to work out the remainder, pardoned shortly afterwards, and granted his full pension by the then Colonial Director, Stübel. An official of the Department, named Poeplau, doubtful whether the pension should have been paid in the circumstances, spoke respectfully of it to his immediate superior, with the consequence that he was subjected to disciplinary proceedings and was dismissed for his indiscretion. Kannenberg's was by no means the only case regarding which Poeplau had spoken his mind with the frankness of an honest man, and he had in consequence rendered himself obnoxious to the authorities. Dr Ablass, who was also Poeplau's legal representative, and able to prove his statements by documentary evidence, said in the Reichstag on Dec. 1, 1906, that, in consequence of Herr Poeplau's representations, the Chancellor had promised to open an enquiry, and that the enquiry was opened—but *against* Herr Poeplau. Dr Ablass added:

'It was clear to me that the whole matter was to be enquired into privately, and that it was intended to hush up the horrible conditions of which Herr Bebel spoke with indignation. In this suppression all the officials of the Colonial Department were united ("Very true," from the Left and Centre), and the Chancellor set his seal upon it. . . . I beg

you to understand that what Herr Poeplau has reported has proved correct in all essential points.'

Poeplau was one of many scapegoats, yet even the Conservative Dr Arendt, the excuser of Peters, felt compelled to say, on March 15, 1906: 'At the outset the colonies served as a dumping ground for damaged reputations, and unsuitable elements were often sent out.'

Of no one was this more true than of Governor von Puttkamer, the nephew of Bismarck and son of a Minister of State, a *roué* and a gambler. Von Puttkamer made himself no enviable reputation in the Cameroons, and this not least by his conduct regarding the so-called Frau von Eckhardstein, otherwise Frau von Germar, *née* Ecke, to whom he not only supplied a false passport when she returned to Germany, after knowing her for many years and allowing her to reside openly at Government House, but whom he sent in to dinner with the Commander of the 'Habicht,' when the latter was there as the naval representative of the Kaiser. The lady seems to have come out of the affair better than von Puttkamer. She at least told her story straightforwardly in a paper entitled 'Neue Gesellschaftliche Korrespondenz,' and proved that, though examined on oath for several hours, she was not allowed to bear witness in court, where her statements were wholly misrepresented.

All this, however, is a small matter in comparison with the wider issues which led to the exposure of von Puttkamer by the Social-Democrats. Their charges covered the ground of his having shut his eyes to atrocities committed by his subordinates, several of which have been already mentioned; that he took no steps to check the incredible immorality of the officials and spent public money on building himself a luxurious residence for ministering to his own pleasures; also that he did not keep his hands clean in regard to the promotion of colonial companies. The Government was forced to take action, and a modified presentation of the charges at Puttkamer's trial before the Disciplinary Court on April 25, 1909, resulted in the inadequate punishment of a fine of 1000 marks. Not least amongst von Puttkamer's sins of omission was his utter neglect

to right, or even take heed of, the wrongs of the Akwa chiefs, although they had repeatedly sought for redress and had finally sent a petition to the Imperial Chancellor and the Reichstag.

The petition setting forth the grievances of the Akwas\* was presented at Berlin in January 1905. On Nov. 2 of the same year, von Puttkamer was informed of it officially; and on the 21st he took proceedings against the petitioners for using insulting language, as did also Regierungsrat von Brauchitsch and Judge Meyer. The chiefs received sentences as follows: Dika Akwa nine years' imprisonment, Muange Mukuri seven, Akwa Elamne two years and six months, and so forth. Mpundo Akwa, being in Germany, was condemned in his absence. The charge of using insulting language was undoubtedly frivolous. True, the petition contained some forcible expressions, but from first to last it was simply the heart-cry of ignorant people burning with a sense of injustice, half believing that a paternal Kaiser would redress their wrongs, and utterly ignorant of legal subtleties. Unable to draw up the document themselves, they sought the assistance of a former native clerk of the District Court, who kept the minutes of their meetings and wrote the petition in German. Von Puttkamer tried to make out that it had been concocted in Germany. The petition dealt with over twenty substantial grievances, none of which could be explained away. A revision of the sentences was therefore ordered by the Imperial Government, and they were substantially reduced. Dernburg, who vacillated between a recognition of the truth regarding the treatment of the natives and an endeavour to screen officialdom at all costs, felt compelled to say: 'It cannot be overlooked that on several points the actions of the Administration and the sentencing of the natives in the Cameroons cannot be approved of.'

The first item of complaint dealt with the ejection of natives from their homes at Duala, 370 huts having been pulled down. This expropriation was contrary to the agreement with Dr Nachtigal, which secured to residents their rights in perpetuity. The plea of sanitary reasons

---

\* Memorandum concerning the Akwas, 'Reichstag Aktenstücke,' No. 323, vol. 241.

was made by the authorities. That was not the whole truth; and, if it were, there yet remains the fact that the expropriation was carried out without a vestige of consideration, and in the rainy season, which added materially to the sufferings of the homeless, especially the women and children. Bebel, referring to it in the Reichstag on March 20, 1906, said: 'They went so far in some cases as to destroy the natives' little household goods by fire. Herr von Brauchitsch allows that for the destroyed houses or huts, as well as for the destruction of the plants and trees, no indemnification whatever was paid.' The huts destroyed were in many cases substantial buildings; and the real reason for their destruction was road-making, for which, as a climax of injustice, natives were forced to give their labour or be flogged or put in chains. In reference to the expropriation at Duala, Deputy Ledebour, on March 20, 1906, quoted a contract, written in English, made between the representatives of the firm of Woermann and the chiefs of the two tribes Akwa and Bell, in which this passage occurs: 'That the land cultivated by us, and the places the towns are built on, shall be the property of the present owners and their successors.' Ledebour continued: 'On the strength of this unrepealed clause the negroes have the right to demand that at least arrangements should be made with them before they are driven out of the towns and places where they live, and as to when these places are to be broken up.' The whole affair resembles Deputy Wels's description of the want of consideration shown at Duala in 1913-14. On May 13, 1914, he said:

'A great tornado blew down many of the small huts in May 1913. The people were ordered to rebuild in a new part of the settlement. In certain cases, they were told that otherwise they would be punished by fines, flogging or imprisonment. I have here a whole row of signed declarations from natives, testifying that the natives have been punished with fines and imprisonment in connexion with the expropriation. I have requested the Secretary of State to place the punishment list before us. That also has not been done, and I can only draw the conclusion that the statements made are correct.' . . .

In view of this, can it be wondered at that 'Native of Aneho,' writing in the 'Gold Coast Leader' on Nov. 7,

1914, says: 'Our wishes for the British rule are based on the fact that only under it can we rise as a nation, and govern ourselves on reformed native lines'; or that he writes on Aug. 8, 1914: 'We do not ask for favours, or for arms. We want to be treated as men; our rulers should know that we have respect for those in our own country, and should desist in treating us as brutes.'

Among the complaints recorded in the petition, frequent mention is made of brutal floggings, from which even the chiefs were not exempt. Reference will be made to that subject presently in all its hideousness. Suffice it to say now that the chiefs were flogged if they could not pay their taxes, flogged if they could not supply oxen under cost price, flogged and bound if they resented forced labour, sometimes of a most dangerous kind, such as cleaning creeks and making dams under conditions which caused many drownings, and flogged if they protected their women from the attentions of the officials. Clause 24 in the Akwa petition points out how Chief Justice Meyer and Regierungsrat von Brauchitsch purchased two girls by force from their parents, girls who were betrothed to two native men, and this though von Brauchitsch had declared repeatedly on palaver days that it was forbidden to take the wife of another man. By native custom, the wooer pays the parents a certain sum on betrothal, and the daughter concerned is looked upon henceforth as the man's wife. The case of von Brauchitsch and von Meyer is the more reprehensible, because to Germans a betrothal is invested with almost the sanctity of marriage. In the colonies the officials seemed to forget all this.

Not only marriageable women, but even children were exposed to their licentiousness. The most revolting case is that of Herr G. A. Schmidt, Station-Director at Atakpame in Togoland, the details of which are unprintable. The case was brought up in the Reichstag by Herr Rören, a Prussian Judge of well-known integrity. Schmidt surrounded himself with 'little play-mates,' and began his career as station-director, by ordering all the girls of the district to come up on the first night for a dance, or their respective mothers would each be fined twenty marks. Schmidt's character and motives being understood, the Fathers of the neighbouring

Catholic mission gave out in church that no girl desirous of becoming a Christian might attend such dances. Schmidt launched a counterblast by forbidding all complaints to the Catholic missionaries; and it may here be stated that von Puttkamer was doing the same in the Cameroons as regards the Evangelical Missions. There may have been, here and there, political agents amongst the missionaries, but, in the main, they were honest Christian men, who, if they ventured to point to the handwriting on the wall, were promptly suppressed and not infrequently driven out of the Colony. Schmidt, however, was determined to revenge himself on the Fathers; and an opportunity was found in connexion with his forcible detention of a young girl named Adjaro, not over fourteen years of age, whom he also flogged. A Catholic Father laid the facts before the District Judge, Lieut. Preyl, who said a written statement must be made to the Chief of the Bureau. This was done, showing that Schmidt had been guilty of repeated crimes of a nature which the natives held in peculiar abhorrence and punished with death. We give the sequence in Deputy Rören's words to the Reichstag, founded on the legal depositions:

'In the dark, at four in the morning, when it is still absolutely dark in tropical countries, District-Judge von Rothberg, who had returned meanwhile, came on horseback, as did also his assistant Lang, who had been quite irregularly appointed as public prosecutor, together with two more, and nineteen black soldiers—came, Gentlemen, not to the station building to arrest the criminal, but to the Mission. They forced their way into the Mission, dragged all the Fathers, just as they were, out of bed, and declared them arrested, without having a warrant or without even answering the questions as to why they were arrested. They hunted through the mission buildings, even through the chapel, uncovered the altar, rummaged through the vestments cupboard, and took away all papers, including receipts and the wills of some of the Fathers. After that, the Fathers were surrounded by the nineteen soldiers with loaded rifles, and led off to prison, with Rothberg and his assistant Lang, on horseback, at their head.'

Rören goes on to relate how these good priests were kept imprisoned for twenty-one days, all their

correspondence, and even that for the Sisters of a distant mission, being seized. The Fathers were forbidden to make or hear confessions according to Catholic practice, unless they undertook first to put the confessions in writing to be submitted to the Governor or else to speak so loudly that the official could hear what they said. Furthermore, difficulties were made in the preparation of these innocent victims' defence, and would-be witnesses were interfered with or got out of the way. The girl Adjaro and her sister and mother were summoned, no doubt for purposes of intimidation, before Schmidt and his friend Kersting, whose character we may estimate by the fact that he had distinguished himself by first shooting a chief with a revolver and then ordering a soldier to cut off the man's head, which, it is averred, he kept as a trophy. The condemnation of Father Schmitz, the leading actor in the quest for redress, was a foregone conclusion; he was sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment for giving false evidence. Yet, on appeal, though no fresh evidence on his behalf was offered, he was acquitted. Deputy Rören, at the close of his remarkable speech, told how Schmidt distinguished himself yet further, by formally and officially proclaiming a black woman of ill-repute as 'Jenusia' (Queen), ordering the people to obey her, giving her power to collect legal dues up to fifteen marks and to decide judicially in any legal quarrel, and finally presenting her with a sword to wear as a mark of royalty. 'Gentlemen,' the deputy concluded, 'one would think that the man had tropical frenzy!' In spite of these facts Schmidt was sent back to Togoland by the Colonial Department; and the Secretary of State, speaking in the Reichstag, on Dec. 3, 1906, said that such campaigns against officials must cease, or no one would enter the Colonial Service.\*

One of the darkest blots on the pages of German colonial administration was undoubtedly the ever-recurring and indiscriminate flogging of natives. Notorious

---

\* At the same time Dernburg threatened the Chapter of Cologne cathedral that he would remove certain of their missionaries from Togoland if they continued their charges against the local officials.

cases of this punishment—as inflicted by the Germans—blacken the name of Landeshauptmann Brandeis, who, when acting in the Marshall Islands, ordered constant floggings and did not enter them in the punishment book. When his delinquencies were mentioned in the Reichstag, the usual official excuses were made for him. He was in a difficult position, it was said; he acted *bonâ fide*; he even flogged for educative reasons. Dernburg, in apologising for him, could not get over the fact that, in some eleven cases, he had been proved to have ordered floggings not legally permissible. Brandeis received a mild reprimand, and eventually a decoration; and this, though no less an authority than Consul-General Knappe of Shanghai, whom Erzberger called ‘one of our most experienced politicians,’ wrote in an official letter that he had witnessed the floggings both in the Marshall Islands and Samoa, and that ‘the impression was a disgusting one, both for white men and black.’ He added, that ‘it caused great excitement, a public meeting of indignation on account of the flogging in the Marshall Islands being only suppressed by the accidental presence of a squadron.’ Erzberger took up the Brandeis case with great vigour, referring to it in more than one speech, and strongly reprehending the practice of the authorities, who sought to throw dust in the eyes of the public regarding the way in which colonial officials exceeded their powers.

That even chiefs, as in the Akwa case, were not exempt from the indignity of public flogging, is a signal proof of the inability of their taskmasters to understand native psychology. Flogging their leaders caused outbreaks of anger and indignation among the natives; or, where the chiefs were not beloved, it lowered them still further in the respect of their tribes. Where influential chiefs were bribed to do whatever was wanted of them, lesser chiefs were beaten severely to attain similar ends. A missionary working in German East Africa in pre-war days refers to the treatment of the natives as being in inverse ratio to the power of the tribes, and adds that the treatment of the lesser chiefs was very severe and no better than that of ordinary natives, a chief seldom getting through a month without being flogged. In the Jaunde district in the Cameroons chiefs were tied up and flogged if they could not supply sufficient carriers,

and after their punishment they were made to carry loads themselves.

In March 1906 Deputy Erzberger, quoting from colonial statistics, said that in East Africa 2293 natives had been sentenced to floggings and birchings in the space of one year, while 2994 natives received floggings as additional punishment; and in April 1912 Deputy Noske showed that matters had not improved, seeing that the numbers of floggings in South-West Africa in 1910 was 1262, and in the Cameroons 1909. Erzberger stated also that, although the numbers flogged in German South-West Africa were not then forthcoming, the account of the prisons there pointed to a 'very raw spot' in Colonial policy; and that Samuel Maherero had said himself that he joined the Herero rising out of fear of being caught and going to perdition in prison—i.e. being flogged to death—as his tribal kinsman had done.

In the German African colonies the punishments legalised for the natives were flogging, fines, imprisonment with hard labour, confinement in chains (a most cruel punishment, of which it was said few men could survive it for more than a year), and death. Corporal punishment was administered either with the sjambok, which should be made of strips of rhinoceros hide 80 to 100 centimetres long, by one in circumference, or with a rope's end steeped in hot tar and then smothered with sand to produce a very rough surface, and used when stiff. The sjambok draws blood profusely at the first stroke, and even Governor von Puttkamer, considering it 'too cruel,' only allowed the use of a rope's end; but the Colonial Department insisted in 1907 on the sjambok being reintroduced. The so-called birch rods were described as 'little sticks,' but cudgels would have been a truer name for them.\* 'Men, women, and children are punished up to twenty-five lashes,' said Bebel. The legal number of strokes was often exceeded; and there is the testimony of eyewitnesses to the fact that officers have frequently said that the first few lashes have been 'no

\* Deputy Rören placed one of these 'weapons,' similar to one with which Judge Rothberg had thrashed one of his porters to death on the way to Atakpame, on the table of the Reichstag on Dec. 3, 1906; and some years previously a rhinoceros whip had been laid dramatically on the table of the House by one of the deputies.

good' and must be administered again. These might be followed, according to official ruling, by a second application, at the interval of at least a fortnight. In this respect the rule was often broken, one flogging following on the other. On many occasions attention was called to the fact that the German African territories were known in the adjacent French and British possessions as the 'Colonies of the Twenty-five,' or the 'Flogging Colonies.'

On Dec. 3, 1906, Deputy Rören said :

'Many of the officials look on the natives not as fellow-men but as welcome objects for the satisfaction of their often very coarse and low passions. The conception is unfortunately promoted by many of the existing administrative arrangements. Amongst these arrangements, I reckon in the first place the institution of corporal punishment, or rather the cruelty and arbitrariness with which it is used. The native, after having been completely stripped, is strapped across a block or a barrel that has been firmly fixed; his hands are bound in front, his feet behind, so that he cannot move; and he does not get a few blows with an ordinary stick held in one hand, but the strongest among the black soldiers has to wield a plaited rope or a correspondingly thick stick with both hands, and with all his strength, and that with such violence that each blow must whistle in the air. It has happened that if the blow does not whistle, it has to be repeated; and, if it does not do so, the Hausa gets it himself. It is self-evident that in the portion of the body thus struck, the blood congeals and causes swelling; and so it has happened that a man thus flogged has been ill or sickly for the rest of his life. Yes, it has happened that weak natives have collapsed after the floggings, and soon died. But with all it is the rule, that for months, indeed for years, they find themselves in such a state of nervous tension that, if someone comes near them unexpectedly, they cower and scream loudly, because they fear and have the feeling that the spot that was beaten may be touched. That, Gentlemen, is cruel and unworthy of human beings, but the real hardship is that this punishment is not the result of judicial sentence for great misdemeanours or crimes, but is inflicted at the arbitrary discretion of administrative officials, even by station-directors, who have officially only the rank of sub-alterns, and is even ordered by their assistants, and by overseers of smaller stations, many of whom have been merely non-commissioned officers. It has happened that even for

household blunders, as, for instance, want of punctuality with the dinner, or its failing to suit the station-director's taste, he is ordered a flogging for it.'

This statement of Herr Rören's is confirmed by case after case within our knowledge. Residents in the German colonies testify to its having been customary for an employer to send a native servant, with whom he was dissatisfied, with a note to the police-station asking that he should be flogged; and this was done without any questions being asked. It was most undesirable that the punishments should be carried out by native soldiers, indifferent to the sufferings of others, who had had it constantly drilled into them that, as 'German soldiers,' they were the most important people in the universe, in comparison with whom 'the rest of the world was mere scum,' and a civilian native 'a dog to be whipped on the slightest provocation.' The *reductio ad absurdum* in this mania for flogging was reached when, according to an official organ, the 'Kölnische Zeitung,' the order was given that, 'to stop a nuisance,' black men who drank straight out of the bottles at the localities where soda-water was sold should be subjected to 'severe corporal punishment and imprisonment.' Dr Müller's comment in the Reichstag was, 'Thank God, this idiocy, which must of course make us a laughing-stock abroad, was redressed by the Colonial Office.'

The highly sensitive South Sea Islanders were not exempt from corporal punishment, though it was known to make physical and mental wrecks of those who underwent it. Erzberger, in one of his many speeches exposing the ill-treatment of the native, said :

'My statement concerning the results of corporal punishment in the South Sea Islands does not belong to the realms of fancy. The missionaries have told me repeatedly that, if a native receives twenty-five blows with a stick, the man shakes from head to foot, so that he is thoroughly ruined in body and mind. If you have him flogged a second time, madness often results.'

Of deaths resulting from flogging there are many instances. Among the Akwas, Muanga-a-Mukuro stated that his brother Nele was flogged to death in the Cameroons; and in 1898 Chief Mensah of Agueguan died

three days after being flogged by the Germans because he would not accept their flag after hearing of the atrocities in Togoland.\* He claimed to be a British subject.

The two following cases from the Cameroons witness to the overbearing brutality of the officials. Strolling one day with an acquaintance through a Government farm at Yabasi, a British merchant saw a labourer lying on the ground and being brutally thrashed by a soldier. He interceded for the man, who was too weak to stand, and had him carried to the hospital, where he died next day. Our correspondent's companion, a German, threatened to communicate the circumstance to a local paper at home, and was told that, if he did so, he would be expelled from the colony. The second occurrence concerns a District Commissioner, Freiherr von Ludinghausen. The Baron went his rounds every morning attended by an orderly carrying a heavy stick, to flog all persons who did not remove their hats, or stand at attention, whilst the District Commissioner passed by. A trader talking to a friend failed on one occasion to notice the Baron, and was handled at once so severely by the orderly, that he staggered into a merchant's store bleeding profusely from several cuts on the back, and lost consciousness. Yet he dared not allow this outrage to be known for fear of getting into bad odour with the authorities.

On Dec. 3, 1906, Deputy Rören told the Reichstag how, when District Judge von Rothberg journeyed in forced marches from Aneche to Atakpame in 1903, all soldiers falling out received twenty-five lashes. Porters were left fainting by the roadside. One porter tried to escape. He was caught, and Rothberg knelt on him, pummelled his face with his fist, and had him held by soldiers and given twenty-five strokes with a cane. The man fell to the ground, and was flogged again. He died where he fell. A similar case happened in regard to an official's cook who had been guilty of unpunctuality. He was twice flogged, and repeatedly kicked in the stomach by his brutal master, being then locked up without food or care. That night he died, and the

---

\* 'Gold Coast Leader,' Sept. 13, 1913, and April 25, 1914.

natives carried him to his grave chanting 'The white man has killed the cook.' Rören sums up by saying: 'This is one of the cases where I cannot exonerate the Colonial Director [Dernburg] from the reproach of hushing-up, for this case was made known to him.'

A resident in East Africa speaks of floggings being 'ordered daily by the administrative officials,' and also by employers. Only managers of estates were supposed to have the right to cause labourers to be flogged, but this rule was broken continually. If a native complained to the Native Commissioner, who might live many miles away, and the employer and the Commissioner were friends, the native was generally flogged again. Native Akidas (Government officials), and even Askaris (police soldiers), were known to order floggings. Cases might be multiplied *ad infinitum*. A missionary, long resident in East Africa, referred to the 'cowed state of the natives, who flew to obey a German officer, if the latter only lifted his finger.' Christian natives greatly resented this treatment. When accusations were brought, in 1915, against two of our own missionaries, who were tried at Tabora charged with teaching the natives heliography and inciting the Wagogo to rise against the Germans, the witnesses on their behalf were intimidated by receiving floggings varying from a hundred to a hundred and ten lashes. Four remained steadfast. One only, being threatened with death, bore false witness momentarily, but at the trial confessed that he had lied, and the missionaries were saved.

Dernburg had no real sympathy for the natives, although he told the Budget Committee of the Reichstag that it made 'a very unfavourable impression to see so many white men going about with negro whips. . . . There was even one on the table of the principal pay office of Dar-es-Salaam.' Nevertheless Deputy Ledebour said in the Reichstag on March 17, 1908, that a member of the Commission would produce a letter from a pastor at Dar-es-Salaam, stating that the natives, who accompanied Dernburg from Muansa to Tabara, said they would never travel with him again, 'never having been so much beaten in their lives.'

It must not be thought that flogging was limited to men. Christian native girls of marriageable age were

flogged at mission stations to prevent their marrying non-Christians. According to German East African papers, this happened at a mission station, though the Imperial Chancellor, in his answer to Dr Müller, Deputy for Meiningen, in 1914, denied official knowledge of it.

Writing on Sept. 25, 1905, in the 'Cape Argus,' a 'Young Dutchman' tells a gruesome story of crimes of which he was an eyewitness. On Feb. 12 he had seen eight women and six children strung up by their necks to trees, and shot. He adds:

'All the women and children we captured, while I was on the march, were treated in the same way. I have seen with my own eyes at least twenty-five of them hanged and shot. Women, not executed, were put to carry very heavy loads in connexion with the harbour works. If, as constantly happened, they fell down from exhaustion, they were sjamboked. They were nothing but skin and bone, picking up bread and refuse, and were flogged when caught doing so.'

Mr Percival Griffiths saw 'children as young as four and five made to work and ill-treated like their unfortunate elders,' and women and children dropping down when carrying heavy bags weighing from 100 to 160 lbs. He says, 'They are sjamboked when they fall until they get up again. Across the face was the favourite place for sjamboking.' Mr Griffiths had seen the blood flowing from the faces of women and little children. He had never himself seen one die on the spot, though he had seen them apparently *in extremis*, but he said they died daily in considerable numbers.

After that, even the outrages practised on men to compel them to work seem as nothing by comparison. Not alone, however, on humanitarian grounds, but because it warred so fatally against colonial development, the so-called forced labour, which was near akin to slavery, merits exposure. The natives were carried off, against their wills, from their homes. Their crops suffered, and their land often remained entirely uncultivated; yet, as pointed out earlier, climatic conditions made the extension of native culture a matter of permanent importance. It was one thing to labour with the prospect of reaping the fruits, as free men, on their own soil; it was quite another to be forcibly seized and

bound, and made to toil under the lash of a cruel overseer through long weary hours, and then herded together at night under conditions so insanitary as to bring every foul and loathsome disease in their train. Prussian unwisdom set systematically to work to ruin their physique and take the heart out of the men on whose well-being and contentment the desired economic success depended. Villages came to be denuded of younger men. Fear of being captured drove them into the bush, where many died from hunger and sickness, and others became the prey of wild beasts. Only very old men, women and children remained in the villages. In some cases the women never saw their husbands for years; the birth-rate sank proportionately; and land, once productive, was left untilled. Nothing else was to be expected where recruiters forced their way into villages, and battered in the roofs, or set the houses on fire, if the men hid themselves in their homes. Police sergeants and their men posted themselves by the wayside at points where natives, carrying their produce to the towns, passed to and fro, and, forcing them to throw down their wares, carried them off, roped to each other, to work on plantations, roads, or railways. Lesser chiefs were employed in this vile service, stimulated by capitation fees to commit gross abuses; others, again, were simply compelled under threats of dire penalties to supply the required number of men from their tribes.

In the words of Deputy Dittmann in 1914:

'The effect of the exploiting reign of capitalism is simply awful upon the natives; and what has become known during the last weeks puts a definite end to the naïve representations that since the Dernburg era a good time had dawned for the natives through the reforms that had been introduced. . . . An awful decimation of the native population runs parallel with the coming to the fore of the so-called capitalistic Kultur.'

The wages on the plantations were of the smallest, and even so were often reduced, owing to the practice of reckoning ten hours of labour as only a quarter-day, by way of punishment for supposed delinquencies. The recognition of these abuses, to which the Social Democrats drew attention in the first instance, was taken up more and more by middle-class politicians and the press,

till in 1914 Herr Dittmann could say truly that, 'a simply overwhelming wealth of proof of the correctness of the assertions of his party had come from that side.'

This forced labour existed in all the African colonies, though the Secretary of State, Dr Solf, told the members of the Reichstag in Committee that theoretically there was none. In East Africa it was veiled under a system of labour tickets, which meant that every black man had to work twenty days a month for the white men, or be taken to the police-station and sjamboked. Deputy Erzberger's comment on this, on March 7, 1914, was that the official report of the Protectorates for 1913-14 bore almost on every page 'a piercing, heart-rending cry concerning the treatment by white men of the black workmen on the plantations.' He added that, if a certain number of plantations in East Africa and the Cameroons could 'only be made to pay by manuring them with the blood of the natives, that would only bring a curse on the colonies and the Fatherland.'

In the Cameroons, especially, conditions were becoming intolerable, and were fearlessly exposed by the Bremen merchant Herr Vietor to the Reichstag Commission. It is not possible here to quote from Vietor's many reports and statements, but it is sufficient to state that they are amply supported by correspondence in our possession and by the statements of many independent witnesses. The testimony we have gathered shows that on many plantations the death-rate was abnormally high, that certain districts were becoming depopulated, that flogging was rampant, and that the labourers were driven in gangs to the plantations like so many cattle, or forcibly impressed into prolonged tasks of road-making and railway-building.

The hut tax was instituted to force the natives to work to earn it, but the earnings were totally inadequate. Here, too, the abuses were not limited to men. We learn of 'pregnant women and school-children' being compelled to help in the arduous task of road-making. Space forbids dealing at length with the subject; it can only be said that a veritable Niagara of evidence has poured in upon us as to the moral, physical and economic *débâcle* caused by a system so revolting that it takes us back in thought to the darkest pages in the world's

history. Not the least ugly feature connected with it is that, where the whip was not included, the brandy bottle was brought into play. Taught to drink 'schnaps,' the natives pledged their farms and sold their freedom for it. That fearless missionary Herr J. Scholze, lecturing at Carlsruhe in October 1904, said :

'The missionaries speak very straightly to the natives, but their critics think one can only lead the negro to work with the whip and alcohol. They use both means of education freely, especially the brandy, which causes the complete degradation of the natives. . . . the more *schnaps*, the more slaves' ('Die Wahrheit über die Heidenmission' U.S.W.).

Neither officers nor civil officials were above using brandy to enlist labourers. Some natives and tribes recognised the danger that threatened to overwhelm them, but unfortunately in most cases they put up a feeble resistance. It was the curse of drink which caused Samuel Maherero, the supreme chief of the Hereros, to let himself become a tool for so many years in German hands, and caused him to part recklessly with farm after farm of tribal land. But it was not till the year 1883 that the Hereros took to heavy drinking. So late as 1874, they had smashed a trader's brandy kegs to save themselves from what they termed 'poisonous devil water.' A few years later they had learnt their lesson from the white man only too well, so that von François wrote of them: 'arms, munitions, and brandy form the chief articles of commerce.'

German writers would have us believe that the Herero rising in 1904 was due to the mistrust aroused by the official stamping of guns, which made the natives fear that their weapons were about to be taken away from them. The same writers put down the awful impoverishment of the tribes to the ravages amongst their cattle caused by the Rinderpest. That is not so. The causes of the Herero rising were the desire to throw off the intolerable yoke of Germany, the spoliation of their lands for concession companies and plantations, the heavy and unjust sentences passed upon them for trivial offences, the inequality between black men and white men before the law, and above all the seizure of their cattle, on which they looked almost with veneration,

because the animals were sacred to the cult of their ancestors, whose wrath they feared to bring down upon themselves if profane hands touched their herds. It is true that the rising began by their murdering 123 Europeans; but, as Irle shrewdly asked, how many blacks had white men murdered previously, and how great and how long had been the provocation which led to these massacres? Not the least important factor in the Hereros' discontent was the reprehensible credit system of German traders, who cunningly forced on them useless articles at fabulous prices and plied them with the *schnaps* that proved their ruin. When, according to the outrageous accounts handed in by the traders, they had mortgaged all they possessed, the Government stepped in and stripped them of it by a judicial decision. When at length the worm turned, the retribution dealt out to the Hereros made their country one vast graveyard. Thousands, driven into barren waterless regions, perished of hunger and thirst. The rest, when they did not escape into British territory, were made prisoners, and were either forced to labour or were kept together in prison camps, where the death-rate was appalling. It is reckoned that only some 20,000 Hereros remained out of 80,000 after the atrocities of the Herero War.\*

EVANS LEWIN.

M. MONTGOMERY-CAMPBELL.

---

\* Nothing has been said in this article about the numerous risings of natives in the German colonies. It should, however, be noted here that Prof. Schillings, the eminent German naturalist, at one time an official in the Colonial Department, stated that within a few years 200,000 people had been shot down in the German colonies, while Dernburg himself admitted that 75,000 natives had perished in the rebellion in East Africa—a war as bloody and ruthless as the Herero war, but less well known.

## Art. 6.—THE EVOLUTION OF REVOLUTION. ✓

THE word revolution is loosely used, in ordinary language, to cover many forms of political and social transformation. In the definite historic sense, revolution means a complete change of the economic, social and class relations in any country, which, whether brought about peaceably or forcibly, ends in the general legalisation of the new system. Mere political revolts are not social revolutions. They may represent a serious attempt at social and economic change from below, or they may be only the displacement of a governing family, or clique, above. To-day, we speak of the revolts in China and Russia as revolutions. Nevertheless, the social and economic modifications in those great countries, below the surface, have, so far, been very small. In neither case has there yet been a reconstruction of society; and, in fact, the true revolution in both countries has only just begun.

The removal of the foreign dynasty of the Manchus, imposed by the last of the Tartar invasions, and the establishment of a purely Chinese Federative Republic, have not led, so far, to any crucial alteration in the general administration, in the methods of production, or in the relations of classes. An obnoxious foreign rule, with its superficial incidents, such as the pigtail, has been got rid of; and the Chinese, as formerly under the native Ming dynasty, are again their own masters. But Chinese institutions of all kinds remain much as they have existed for many centuries, with a vast agricultural peasant proprietary as the basis of society, and family rule and ancestor worship binding the fabric closely together. The ancient arrangements have only been modified by the partial introduction of railways, tramways, steamers, the great factory industry, telegraphs, telephones and other improvements from the West. Some day these will undoubtedly cause a real social revolution throughout the Flowery Land, in spite of the natural conservatism of the masses of the people. The abolition of the pigtail and the recovery by women's feet of their natural shape are merely returns to sensible old customs; but, when the graves of the dead are freely

allowed to be desecrated by the passage of steel rails and locomotive haulage, it is clear that the established conceptions of a superstitious and ancestor-worshipping nation have been shaken.\*

The tendency towards modern organisation and modern management, under Chinese control, is growing faster every day. But this had already begun under the last Manchu Emperors, one of whom was the first to formulate and decree a definite programme of reconstruction, upon the very same lines as the Republic is now following. The reactionary policy of the Dowager Empress and the Boxer risings checked progress for the time; but the attempts at political reaction against the Republic not long ago made at Peking have proved, by their complete failure, that few desire to go back to the old Imperial system, whether under a Manchu or a Chinese Emperor.

The era of a dominant autocracy residing in the Northern capital has come to an end. The Chinese of the great Provinces have decided that their local self-government shall be preserved, federated for national business, in a republican shape, and that further development shall take place under the management of the Chinese themselves. It may be hoped, therefore, that the displacement of the Tartars, which has occurred so often before in Chinese history, will now be final. But the real revolution, as already said, is only beginning to-day; and it will have vast consequences. An educated and intelligent population, consisting of a huge industrious agricultural body and a commercial class of exceptional ability, brought into direct contact with subversive industrial methods on a large scale, must soon exercise a tremendous influence on the markets of the planet.

In Russia the overthrow of the Romanoffs was also in itself a superficial occurrence. It happened, as it were, by accident, and before either the forces of revolt

---

\* It was Turgot who said that if every one who lived since man began his existence on this planet had been provided with a cenotaph, it would long since have been necessary to destroy the tombs of the dead in order to furnish food for the living. Paul Louis Courier, writing for once in a grandiose style, declared, 'Les monuments se conservent où les hommes ont péri, à Baalbec, à Palmyre et sous les cendres de Vésuve.'

in the towns, or of the peasantry in the country, were prepared to face the very difficult problems of reconstruction which immediately demanded solution. Had not the reactionists of Tsardom attempted a counter-revolt of their own, in order to anticipate a popular rising, the upheaval would hardly have taken place at that particular time. The frequent disturbances in the Germanised capital of Petrograd which followed upon the first successful rising, the war with the German invaders on the front, the mutinies of the troops themselves, due to Bolshevik propaganda and bribery from without—all this necessarily complicated the situation and diverted the attention of Western Europe from the gigantic economic issues below.

We are, in fact, looking on at a day-to-day development of the French Revolution as displayed in a newspaper cinematograph on an enormously greater scale.\* A vast rural population of some 165,000,000 persons, in the 18th-century or 17th-century stage of development and culture, heavily taxed and appallingly poor, is striving for emancipation and endeavouring to take final possession of the soil. This population consists of various races and nations, speaking different languages, and all with different histories behind them. At the same time, the proletariat of the great cities, which is not more than nine per cent. of the total inhabitants of Russia, created partly by the steady expropriation of the peasantry, partly by the policy of State industries, and partly by the introduction of foreign capital and foreign employment on a large scale—this proletariat of the cities, divorced from the soil and possessed of no property but the power to labour in their bodies, is endeavouring to apply the latest theories of the scientific Socialism of the West to a state of society which is not

---

\* The difference between the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution is that, whereas the French had a class already developed which was versed in local administration and capable of taking up the reins of Government, the Russians scarcely possess such a class, outside the corrupt and hated bureaucracy of the *tschinovniks*. That, as Russia is now sadly discovering to her cost, is a very serious matter indeed. Even the anarchical outbreaks of the *Jacquerie*, sometimes leading to terrible outrages of which we are allowed to hear little in England, are not so dangerous as this entire lack of capable and trustworthy native administrators.

yet nearly ripe for the successful application of such theories. Nothing of the kind has been seen before in history. The entire situation is wholly exceptional.

The social and economic development of modern Russia begins with the emancipation of the serfs in the period 1861-1866. This emancipation, as all the world knows, was, economically speaking, much more nominal than real. Instead of recognising the complementary portion of the old statement of the peasants: 'We are the Lord's; the land is ours,' Alexander II relieved the serfs from their personal servitude to the nobles, but only gave them the land under conditions that left them, in most respects, worse off than before. Had the Tsar Alexander risked a revolt of the boyars, and given the land outright to the peasantry (as Joseph II of Austria had attempted to do in Bukovina), then a great and beneficial revolution would have been peacefully effected, and his dynasty might have been permanently secured on the throne.

Probably the mischiefs arising out of further unconscious economic changes could not have been averted; but the emancipated serfs would have obtained a generation or two of comparative well-being. As it was, these unpropertied freedmen acquired their land at a very heavy cost, by payments spread over fifty years; State taxation became heavier and heavier; while, all the time, the substitution of production for sale in place of production for use by themselves, the lord and his retainers, made the emancipated serfs mere slaves of their unfortunate surroundings. Simultaneously, the increasing debt of the Russian Government to the capitalism of Western Europe, for strategical railways, State industries and the like, established a drain of agricultural produce, to pay interest on these advances, without commercial return, which intensified the difficulties of the rural districts. All this combined pressure on the peasantry gradually created a non-agricultural class, which was attracted to the cities by the State industries set on foot by the Government and fostered by loans and investments from without. Thus the city proletariat of Russia, still a small minority of the population, is mainly a factitious growth, fostered from without by State organisation within.

As a consequence, the economic and intellectual antagonism between country and town, which results everywhere from the system of production for profit, has been intensified in Russia. Peasants are producing cereals and other agricultural commodities by primitive methods of cultivation. They do this more and more for sale for cash on the market, in order to pay taxes which are rigidly exacted in cash, to meet the usurious charges on the debts they have been forced to contract, and to purchase improved tools and manures where they can. But in every case they want to get high prices for what they have to sell, as their sole means of relief from crushing burdens. Similarly, high prices for the goods which are the output of their interminable toil on small home industries during the long winter months can alone give hope of squeezing a little better wage from their employers or the middlemen.

On the other hand, the new wage-earning townsfolk want to get those necessities of life which the peasants offer as cheaply as possible, so that their own scanty wages may go farther. And the land cultivators cannot escape from the effects of an economic pressure, the development of which they can neither understand nor cope with, and the expansion of which they are unable to resist. This was a serious situation even in peaceful and quiet periods. Amid revolution and war, it becomes nothing short of appalling. Though the drain to the West for interest on foreign loans and invested capital, amounting to not less than 55,000,000*l.* a year out of a total value of exports, estimated in 1912 at 160,000,000*l.*, was temporarily suspended in 1914, owing to the impossibility of exportation, the pressure of taxation on the mass of the peasantry was not reduced to that extent. And, from the moment when the revolution began, the necessity for funds forced the Government to issue paper money in excess of any possible power to meet it in cash. In consequence, the value of the rouble, remaining, for the sale of agricultural produce, at the old amount of two shillings, before the war (as against the nominal amount of three shillings), fell for the purchasing of articles required by the peasants for tillage, etc., to the level of sixpence or less, and the price of such articles rose accordingly to an unprecedented height.

Even the seizure of the unredeemed land, or the repudiation of redemption payments, could not obviate the economic crisis. The peasants, naturally enough, would not sell their grain, upon which at least they could exist, for a price reckoned in paper money at its old value, when they could get none of their necessities except at inordinate rates for the deteriorating paper thus paid to them. Therefore, the real Russian Land Revolution is beginning under conditions which may bring about first anarchy and then reaction. Yet production for profit instead of use, the antagonism of town and country, crushing taxation, and deteriorating paper money—all these only hasten the greater economic change. Reaction itself, even with a full force of a reorganised army behind it, could not withstand the march of economic development. The peasantry demand the land, and they will get it. They are refusing to fight the foreign invaders at the front, in order that they may not forgo their share of the redistribution at the rear. The entire peasantry of Russia, with all the differences that separate them, have in the main the same desires. In the Ukraine, with its old-settled population and eagerness for national recognition and local self-government; in Siberia, where immigrants are increasing more rapidly than in Canada; in the rich but deteriorating black-earth region, and in the poor soil of the forest districts, the people demand the ownership of the land, light taxation, relief from usury, and the removal of irresponsible bureaucrats. However ignorant they may be, they all understand *that* programme, and yearn for its accomplishment.

The civilised world has, in fact, entered upon a period of unrest which greatly transcends in extent, as well as in importance, the European disturbances of 1848. Probably it will far surpass even the epoch of the French Revolution in its influence upon the destinies of mankind. But the character of the transformations brought about depends upon the stage of economic and social development that has been reached in every nation affected. Certainly, the general movement will be towards Collectivism and Socialism; but it is absurd to compare vast rural nations such as Russia, China, or even France, with Great Britain, Germany, America or Belgium, where the

huge machine industry, with its complementary evolution of Trusts, Combines and State Control, has developed almost to its full extent. In the former countries there are several steps of social readjustment to be mounted, before the capitalist system of production of goods for profit, through exchange on the world-market, gets far enough to render the socialisation of the means of creating wealth, and the consequent production for *use* instead of profit, upon an enormous scale, not only possible and desirable but inevitable. Japan has shown us that a nation of our time may, in forty years, pass through changes which Western Europe required centuries to traverse. But such a rapid transformation is very rare; and in any event, quickly or slowly, the successive stages must be realised and lived through before the ultimate reconstitution is attained. That is why revolution in a country such as Russia, just emerging from what economists call natural production, involves modifications in ideas and in social affairs totally different from what revolution in a highly-developed industrial country, such as England or Germany, would produce.

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the human race than the unconsciousness of mankind in their progress from one period of social development to another. Even a hundred and fifty years ago, or less, the greatest brains of our own period understood no more of approaching social changes than the ablest philosophers of antiquity did about the rise of slavery or its decline. The conditions which made for slave-owning had created a form of society apparently so permanent that any crucial change seemed impossible. Religion gave no hint; ethics led nowhither; only economics, the lessons of which were entirely unapprehended, at last enforced a change and compelled the gradual transformation. The power of the great landlords and slave-owners of Rome and antiquity generally declined, not by the invasion of the barbarians from without, but by causes which silently sapped the edifice within.

A really complete revolution may be accomplished without bloodshed, at the critical time, when all is ready for the change. But the revolts against an existing form of domination, before that stage has been reached,

have been invariably unsuccessful and often accompanied by horrible cruelty and massacres. It is just the failure of such revolts, when they come before their time, which compels us to regard the process of class domination through the centuries in the light of a natural phenomenon, unmoved by feeling and uninfluenced by morality of any kind. The inevitable change marches slowly and relentlessly onward over the heaps of slaughtered human bodies piled beneath the Juggernaut car of economic advance.

The risings of the slaves against Roman slaveholders in Italy, Sicily and the Provinces were fully justifiable. But their repeated efforts to obtain freedom failed to win any general amelioration of their condition. To all appearance slavery in both East and West was a permanent institution. Its continuance in full vigour depended, however, upon causes that were beginning to disappear; thus its base was rotting even when it seemed at the height of its power. The two elements which enabled slave cultivation and slave production generally to hold their own were the cheapness of the slaves themselves on the market and the cheapness of their keep as compared with the wealth they produced. Cheapness on the market depended upon the supply of slaves being kept up by conquest or by domestic breeding; and supply by conquest was the far more important source. When this failed, the value of slaves inevitably rose. Slave labour, too, is always relatively inefficient. The exhaustion of soil, which almost invariably accompanied its use, by degrees increased both the cost of production and the price of maintenance. Moreover, the difficulty and expense of replacement rendered greater care of the slaves and less pressure upon them essential. Hence the labour of free men became more and more important, and slave production less and less profitable.

Therefore manumission gained ground rapidly. Only the very rich could afford to acquire or to keep large bodies of slaves. What all the valour of Spartacus and his fellows had failed to achieve before economic forms were ripe was slowly but silently obtained by the irresistible force of economic progress. Risings there were; the invasion of the barbarians may have hastened the destruction of slavery, though, speaking generally,

their influence was definitely reactionary ; but the chief forces which brought about the change were the almost unrecognised modifications of the social conditions mentioned. Then it was that ethical considerations previously disregarded—rebuking the ownership of man by man—began to have their effect upon the slave-owners as individuals and as a class. It became a good moral deed to release bondmen from the yoke, as soon as it proved socially profitable in most cases.

With the general break-up of order and organisation, a new form of servitude, serfdom, was gradually established. It eventually fell in the same way. Serfs, whose fathers and ancestors had become the bondmen of their feudal lords, were little better off than their social ancestors, the slaves. Here, again, a similar course was followed wherever the feudal system, with its complicated nexus of personal relations, was established. French villeins and peasants, German Bauers and Leibeigeners, English serfs and bondmen rose in revolt century after century. All in vain. Time after time their attacks were suppressed with a ruthless cruelty quite equal to that shown by any slave-owner general of ancient days. The men whose names stand out in history as the noblest, most courageous and most magnanimous in their dealings with those of their own caste, distinguished themselves above all by the hideous ferocity and love of torture which they glutted upon their unruly peasants. Church and Law, Science and Philosophy took sides with the men in possession. For centuries neither morality nor religion intervened.

Here, again, so long as the lords played an active and useful part in the social life of the period, so long as natural production for use was still the determining factor in the national existence, so long did serfdom continue side by side with yeoman cultivators gaining ground in the country, and free guilds making their way in the cities. In England, where the emancipation was probably first completed, it took more than three centuries to transform the serfdom which was established before William the Conqueror into peasant ownership under various forms. The soil, which the serfs universally regarded as their own, was gradually released to them and their personal freedom secured. But very gradually.

The mills of economic emancipation ground slowly, but they ground exceeding small; the forces of unrest and revolt failed to hasten the pace until unrecognised causes rendered enfranchisement certain. Once again, ethics and religion played quite a subordinate part until economic influences had done their work. Then the Church, which had performed the same service for chattel slaves, shrewdly preached as a religious duty that emancipation which had already become economically and ethically inevitable. Even so, the remains of actual serfdom were to be found in Scotland so late as the 18th century. In Russia and Poland serfdom remained in full force, despite innumerable risings, until the latter half of the 19th; and even then emancipation was enacted from above as a result of obvious social necessity. Unfortunately, in this latter case, as already noticed, nominal individual freedom did not carry with it the actual possession of the land.

Many, however, still argue and attempt to act as if organised, or even unorganised, force could anticipate events, ahead of economic and social development, and at the same time hinder forcible reaction. The favourite instance of this is the French Revolution. In that case at least we are frequently told that force did 'act as the midwife of progress, delivering the old society pregnant with the new.' But this statement will not bear examination. Apart from the historical truth that, in the centuries prior to the Revolution itself, serfdom and the power of the nobles had been greatly weakened, what actually took place shows conclusively that force did *not* realise that which its advocates set out to achieve. There were far more people slaughtered by the White Terror than by the Red. The ancient nobility fell, not because of the vigour of the attack made upon it, but because it had already forfeited its social position by its own action; and the class emancipated was not the agricultural producing class, but that section of the people economically ready and administratively trained to succeed to power, namely, the *Tiers État*, or the bourgeoisie. Even when, after the downfall of Napoleon's military reaction, the Allied troops were withdrawn, some sixty years elapsed before a French Republic was definitely constituted; and that Republic also is a bourgeois Republic to this day.

The most reactionary annalists of the period admit that the downfall of the *Ancienne Noblesse* was due to economic causes rather than to violence. The old system of privilege and exemption from national taxation could not work any longer. It was not the licentiousness, extravagance and cruelty of the aristocracy which brought them down. So long as they chiefly lived on their estates, like the Junkers of to-day, and conducted their own business, all this turpitude, however objectionable morally, failed to shake their power. When, however, they betook themselves to Court, managed their estates through agents, and combined with the Church to fleece their countrymen for no advantage to the rising middle-class, they fell, because they had become not only vicious but obviously useless. They could not even handle effectively the means of resistance at their hand. 'Why did you run away?' the fugitive nobles were asked at Cologne. '*Nous étions des lâches,*' was the reply. They were not physically cowards—both men and women proved this at the crisis of their fate; but they felt that their position could not be defended, so they lacked the moral courage to hold on. So strong also was the reaction, so slow the growth of the new forms, that, great as was the political transformation from the commencement of the revolution in 1789 to the restoration of Louis XVIII in 1815, the restored aristocrats were able to obtain some compensation from the National Assembly for the properties of which they had been deprived.

The same causes made themselves felt in the great development of capitalist production and factory industry which, beginning in its recognised shape in England about the middle of the 18th century, has spread and is still spreading over the civilised world. This change moved far more rapidly than any previous social modification. But it went forward in this island, as well as later in the United States, without any national superintendence or control. The horrors thus engendered fully equalled any of the chattel-slave or serf period. Children of tender years were never deliberately worked to death for the profit of the slave-owner or the feudal lord, as they were by capitalist employers at the end of the 18th and during the first half of the 19th century. But the resistance of the wage-earners proved as useless as the

previous risings against slave-owners, nobles and land expropriators had been futile. Luddite anarchist destruction of machinery, Chartist organised denunciation and physical-force movements against the capitalists had no effect. Within a century or less, Great Britain was revolutionised from an agricultural country into being almost entirely a nation of manufacturers and profiteers. The peasant became a landless wage-earner; the land population was drafted into cities; and the cities grew up with the most crowded and miserable dens in which a pauperised proletariat had ever been housed. Such limitations as there were to the employers' power to work women and children to death were chiefly due to opposition made by the landowners to the factory-owner class that was depriving them of political control.

Thus the transformation from home production and domestic industry to importation from abroad and great factory industry—one of the greatest economic and social revolutions ever known in any country—was achieved in Great Britain, not certainly without much perturbation and discontent culminating in armed violence, but, relatively to the crucial character of the change effected, with little bloodshed. Once more, individual revolts against economic conditions failed; for the victory of the capitalist and profiteering class was complete. During eighty years, from 1765 to 1848, the class-war between capital and labour was open and avowed. In the latter year capital won, owing to the gold discoveries, free trade, and the emigration of the most vigorous portions of the population.

Thenceforward the struggle took a different shape. First strikes, and then, very gradually, political action, carried on the strife, but with little advantage to the workers. They adopted the theories of the profiteering class; and the English proletariat became, as M. Clemenceau expressed it to me some ten years ago, a bourgeois class. They accepted, that is to say, the whole scheme of wagedom, capitalism and profiteering as a permanent social system. Their hope of emancipation before 1848 had lain in some sort of return to pre-industrial conditions; from 1848 to 1914 they aspired, not to uplift the whole disinherited class (practically ninety per cent. of the entire people), but to become

members, as individuals, of the section that existed by trading upon differences of value. Not even the spread of the great Cooperative movement, or the continuous Socialist agitation from the beginning of 1881, or even the affiliation of the Labour Party to the International Socialist Party, and the voting strength displayed at the elections of 1906, could turn the tide in favour of Socialist ideas.

At the beginning of the war in 1914, the general aspect of affairs was much the same as it had been for the previous generation. True, on the one hand, working-class combinations had grown far more numerous and formidable. True, also, on the other, that the combinations of vast capitalist enterprises had utterly refuted the old theories of individual competition as the salvation of society and the cause of all progress. True, lastly, that State interference had greatly increased. But neither the working classes nor the dominant profiteering and landlord classes understood how far this unconscious reintegration of industrial anarchy had gone. Still less did either side comprehend that Capitalism as a system had reached its culminating point, was already tottering to its fall, and would prove itself wholly incapable of dealing with a great national emergency. To-day, the entire community has learnt these facts—through the agency of the war. State control, however partially, incompetently and reluctantly administered, is replacing individual competition in every important branch of our national life.

The history of this latest phase of social evolution has been much the same in the various countries which have attained to a similar stage of the industrial evolution. The United States of America, notwithstanding the enormous and fruitful territory it has had to colonise, in spite also of the fact that not less than half its population of 110,000,000 is still directly connected with the cultivation of the soil, has, in not a few directions, run ahead of the old world. Nowhere has Capital organised itself with such marvellous capacity for rapid improvement of processes and the determination to 'scrap' all but the most perfect means of extracting ores, of dealing with and distributing agricultural products, manufacturing on a large scale, standardising its appliances

and products in order to save labour and cheapen selling values; while at the same time Trusts and Combines on an unprecedented scale have made use of the vast power acquired by common action to crush competition and to uphold prices. On the other side of the Atlantic, also, as on this, the labouring class has endeavoured to meet the relentless force of organised capital by combinations of its own. Threats uttered by the railway men to hold up the entire trade of the country practically forced Mr Wilson to use the great Federal power with which he is invested on behalf of the men, in order to secure for the workers in that department an Eight Hours' Day by direct State action.

It is obvious that this is only a beginning. No great nation could possibly allow the *imperium in imperio* which the economic, and to a large extent the political, domination of the great monopolist Trusts represent, to go forward uncontrolled. If the decisions of the Courts avail not to support the interests of the people, then the community as a whole must reorganise the entire system for the benefit of all. This is far easier with Trusts than with the earlier development of individual factory-owners or distributors. That fact the more able upholders of the Trust system themselves publicly acknowledge. Nor can there be any doubt that the entrance upon the war of the United States as a great world-power will hasten on socialisation in the Republic of the West. An enormous territory like America, with agriculture practically still the supreme interest, cannot take the same course in the new advance as England, which has allowed its rural population to be removed and its land cultivation to be crippled. But that collective will replace individual or Company ownership and management in both countries is already apparent, whether we call the change Socialism or not, whether the transformation involves class antagonism expressed in open violence, or a peaceful outlet is to be given by wide constitutional change.

Almost with the rapidity of Japan, Germany has in a generation passed through an evolution which needed more than a century to accomplish here. And Germany has taken still more definite steps towards the new phase. Her capitalism has at no time enjoyed the freedom from

State control that existed in Great Britain and the United States. Nor has she, in the exultation of her marvellous growth of factory industry, neglected any measures deemed necessary for the improvement of agriculture by State aid in the direction of enhancement of production and cheapening of transport. Her landed proprietors have dominated the entire German national policy at home as abroad, and have taken care to fortify their position both economically and politically, not only by the application of science to agriculture but by protectionist duties and jerrymandered representation. The Social-Democratic Party, the largest single political party in Germany, played into the hands of this powerful reactionary element by their acceptance of the Pan-German Chauvinist cry of 'Deutschland über Alles,' and their shameful betrayal of their principles and pledges at the beginning of the campaign of aggression and atrocity started by the Central Powers. During the war, administrative collectivism has inevitably advanced even beyond the position it held before. But Germany's political forms, like our own, are many years behind her social and economic development; moreover, they are so handled as to hinder all democratisation, however much they may facilitate the increase of State-administered Collectivism. Those who know Germany best may well doubt whether the Fatherland will be able to carry through the coming reorganisation, whatever it may be, without a desperate internal struggle. So long as the war lasts and the German armies are fighting on foreign territory there will be no possibility of revolution at home. But, when the Teutonic hosts are manifestly beaten, a very different spirit will be awakened against the caste which has inflicted such bootless ruin upon Central Europe. Bankruptcy and armed revolt will precede the inevitable political change, whatever form the economic conditions may take.

In that respect, defeated Germany will be at a great disadvantage compared with victorious though exhausted France. French political forms are far ahead of the French economic status. The real France is still rural France. Political France is democratic to a point that no country with so large an agricultural population has ever yet attained. France, therefore, which led the way

in 1789, will be the European country best placed for sober reconstruction in 1919. Her national position and confidence will be restored; her idealism, clarified, it may be, by the loss of her Russian investments, will fire her enthusiasm without shaking her judgment.

Great Britain stands in a more difficult yet more interesting and hopeful position than any European nation. The remarkable extension of State power in the course of the war, already referred to, has rendered the thorough-going revolution from capitalism to Co-operative Communism economically and socially far more easy than it would have been before. The economic forms are, in fact, ready for the change; only capable intelligence is needed to apply them. What Karl Marx truly said to me five-and-thirty years ago is, on this account, doubly true to-day. 'England is the one country in Europe where a peaceful revolution is possible; but,' he added, 'history does not tell us so.' If only our dominant class had been wise enough to make ready by a thorough-going reform of our Constitution in a democratic sense, while at the same time removing by sound education the ignorance of the mass of our people, the saving clause of Marx's forecast might have been expunged. As it is, our political institutions are at least three generations behind our industrial development.

Universal Adult Suffrage, Proportional Representation, The Initiative and Referendum, one effective National Assembly of moderate dimensions, a series of popularly elected Administrative Committees — such organisation of democracy is still, according to our politicians, outside the domain of practical politics. Instead of this we have a vast mass of wasteful and incompetent bureaucratic departments piled on the top of one another, whose main object is, under an appearance of grudging Collectivism, to perpetuate the parasitic methods which must spell national ruin, come what may. Even now, with the millions of trained men who will return from the front to demand their share in the more generous national life which should be the outcome of their efforts, our ruling classes are thinking solely of their own pockets and their own future.

Here is danger, and danger of a very serious nature. Never before in our long history has the entire manhood

of this nation been liable to military service. Never before in any country have millions of trained soldiers, after being withdrawn from national industry, been returned to the old conditions. Never, certainly, has such a huge financial burden been laid upon the people as that which the workers of Great Britain, who have done most of the fighting and the producing during the war, will have to shoulder after the peace, if the existing financial organisation is maintained. Never at any period were legitimate causes of discontent more rife among our population at home, or likely to be more active among the men who return from abroad. Never was the outlook more unpromising for food prices, when all nations will be competing on the world-markets for any surplus of necessities, and so little preparation has been made to increase production at home.

In such circumstances it is imperative that the old bourgeois notions of political economy should be relentlessly scrapped, as Americans and Germans scrap inferior machinery. This has been done during the war; it will be necessary on a much larger scale and as part of a complete policy during the peace. No greater or more inspiring opportunity has been offered us, in all our long and stirring history, of leading mankind in peaceful and orderly fashion towards the attainment of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

H. M. HYNDMAN.

✓ Art. 7.—THE PRINCIPLES OF RECONSTRUCTION.

1. *Reconstruction Committee. Sub-Committee on Relations between Employers and Employed: Interim Report on Joint Standing Industrial Councils.* [Cd 8606.] Wyman, 1916.
2. *Memorandum on the Industrial Situation After the War: The Garton Foundation.* Harrison, 1916.
3. *Labour and the New Social Order. A Report on Reconstruction.* The Labour Party, London, Jan. 1918.
4. *Self-Government in Industry.* By G. D. H. Cole. Bell, 1917.
5. *The Industrial Outlook.* Edited by H. S. Furniss. Chatto & Windus, 1917.
6. *Towards Industrial Freedom.* By Edward Carpenter. Allen & Unwin, 1917.
7. *The Trade of To-morrow.* By Ernest J. P. Benn. Jarrolds, 1917.
8. *Industrial Reconstruction.* Edited by Huntley Carter. Fisher Unwin, 1917.

I. PRIMARY CONSIDERATIONS.

WHEN the word 'Reconstruction' first came into prominence as applied to the reorganisation of our national life, its meaning was, comparatively speaking, definite and limited. It implied, in the first place, the provision of adequate machinery for dealing with the problems of demobilisation; in the second place, a consideration of how the wastage and devastation caused by the war might best be made good; in the third place, due preparation for the intensified commercial competition which was foretold as the inevitable accompaniment of the return to peace. It was seen at once that all these questions were intimately connected with the general problem of industrial unrest, and that, unless some basis of cooperation between employers and employed could be discovered, there was little prospect of effecting the necessary readjustments, or of obtaining the desired standard of output. The improvement of industrial relations was accordingly indicated as a special object of study to the Reconstruction Committee; and this body appointed a sub-committee for the purpose, whose labours bore fruit in the Whitley Report.

So far the scope of reconstruction was rigidly limited to the industrial sphere, and its objects were almost exclusively economic; but it soon became evident that the exertions and sacrifices of the war had given birth to a new spirit of criticism and of aspiration, which was at work in every department of national activity. A mere desire to find the means of passing successfully through an economic crisis has been succeeded by a genuine, if at times a somewhat nebulous resolve to make the whole life of the nation more worthy of the blood which has been shed to preserve it, and to date from the conclusion of peace a new era in domestic as well as in international affairs. We have to deal, in fact, not with a mere question of 'reconstruction'—the adaptation of old machinery to new conditions—but with a renaissance, a quickening of the national spirit, concerned primarily not with machinery or systems, but with the lives and happiness of human beings.

It is in this spirit that every existing institution, social, political, educational, industrial, is being questioned; and almost every week sees some new project of reform put forward in the press or on the platform. Unfortunately it cannot be said that this criticism is always based on any well-considered standard, or that many of the programmes are inspired by a clear vision of the goal to be achieved. The conditions of modern life are not, in truth, favourable to deliberate action. The rapidity with which events succeed each other, the instantaneousness of communications, the triumphs of modern organisation and invention, have combined to produce an atmosphere in which stress is laid rather upon achievement than upon purpose. So long as the march of civilisation can be hastened, there are comparatively few who stop to consider the direction in which it is moving.

The danger of hasty and ill-considered action is at least not lessened by the spread of democracy in its present form. It is the weakness of democracies—especially of democracies in which education is at the same time universal and defective—to be impatient. And this impatience is very apt to take the form of demanding that 'something must be done,' without much consideration of what is possible or desirable, or of mistaking

catchwords for principles and formulating a programme without having thought out a policy. From this tendency springs the peculiar sensitiveness of modern governments to agitation; for in this infirmity of purpose sectional interests find an opportunity to further their own aims under cover of the plea of public utility.

This impatience of thought as the preliminary to action marks much of what is said and written about reconstruction to-day. On the one hand there is a vague aspiration towards a better order of society; on the other, there are many concrete programmes, coloured, probably quite innocently and unwittingly, by the prejudices and ambitions of particular classes or groups. It will be well, before we stand committed to any definite scheme, to call a halt and to ask ourselves what is our conception of a well-ordered national life. That is the question to be answered, not only by politicians and reformers, but by the nation as a whole and the individual citizen for himself, if the shaping of our future is not to become the sport of chance, or to be warped by the influence of sectional interests.

We shall be well advised to state our answer in the simplest and most elementary terms, for it is precisely the most elementary truths which are in the greatest danger of being overlooked. The habit of taking fundamentals for granted has led to the erection of many political structures on a false foundation. We need to keep steadily before us a simple, and, if possible, a non-controversial definition of the object for which national institutions are framed, and to bring back continually every scheme of reconstruction to be tried by this touchstone. Such a touchstone may perhaps be found in the words of Hooker:

'Forasmuch as we are not by ourselves sufficient to furnish ourselves with competent store of things needful for such a life as our nature doth desire, a life fit for the dignity of man; therefore, to supply those defects and imperfections which are in us, living single and solely by ourselves, we are naturally induced to seek communion and fellowship with others.'

That is to say, the nation as a human community must be tested by the degree in which the mass of its citizens attain to a life 'fit for the dignity of man'; by which is

implied, first, such share of material welfare as is necessary to lift a man above the constant pressure of animal needs, and to gratify the demands of his nature for order, decency, comfort, and a measure of beauty in his surroundings; secondly, opportunity for the exercise of his faculties and the development of his social instincts in intercourse with his fellows. It is required of the individual, as a social unit, that he shall minister to the utmost of his power, whether as thinker, artist, statesman or craftsman, to the needs and desires of his fellow-citizens. It is required of the nation, as a community, that each of the individuals composing it shall participate, to the full extent of his capacity, in the material prosperity and the intellectual or spiritual activities arising from the common effort.

Every community, however, is something more than the sum of its units; and national life is something more than the sum of individual activities. The common efforts of many generations have built up a body of corporate achievement, corporate traditions and corporate ideals, which has become the rightful heritage of every individual citizen; and the present generation itself has in its power to shape, in large measure, the lives of those which are to come. This inheritance from the past, this responsibility for the future, are a part of that common stock for which the nation is a trustee to the individual and the individual to the nation.

It is by the participation of its people in all these phases of communal activity that the vitality of a nation is to be judged—by their share in the creation and distribution of wealth, in the evolution of thought and culture, in the shaping of political institutions and the building up of the corporate tradition. If there remains any class or group which fails to participate consciously and fully in these activities, either through indifference to its obligations, or through circumstances which cramp its energies or hinder the gratification of its reasonable demands, the life of the whole nation is impoverished and the structure of its social order stands condemned.

This conception of the nation as a living organism, of which its citizens are members, will have a bearing on our ideas as to the part which the State should play in the direction of our national activities. The conception

of the State as a separate entity, possessing power over the lives of its citizens but responsible only to itself, arose in countries in which political power is confined, altogether or in great part, to a particular class or a particular order, or where the population of the State, as a political unit, is not united by the ties of common nationality. In such countries there is often a clear distinction between the interest of the State, as represented by the governmental machine, and the individual interest of the citizens, or even their collective interest as a social community. Even if the State, or the Government as representing the State, desires the welfare of the governed, it does so, primarily, in order to increase the power and stability of the political unit, in the guidance of whose activities the bulk of the population has no real, though it may have a nominal share. In these cases, therefore, the Government claims, logically enough, to choose for its subjects the kind of good to be pursued, and to regulate in every detail the methods by which it is to be obtained.

Where the political unit is based on the principle of nationality and the form of government is representative, such distinctions can have no legitimate place. For, whether we regard the State as implying the whole commonwealth—the nation considered in its corporate capacity—or confine the term to the governmental machine by which the corporate action of the community is directed, it can have no existence apart from the life of the nation itself. And in that life, its activities, its achievements and its responsibilities, it is at once the duty and the privilege of the citizens to participate. In such a case, the State is the visible symbol and representative of the national life, the guardian of the common stock and the instrument of the common will. Its sovereignty is delegated and held in trust for the welfare of the individual citizens, in fulfilment of the implied contract by which the sovereignty of the individual is limited by his obligations to the community.

This view of the State affects not merely the objects which it will seek, but the manner in which it will seek them. An irresponsible Government may, as has been said, impose upon any section of its subjects such institutions as it deems to be for their good, and direct their

activities into the channels which it regards as advantageous. But healthy national life is a thing of organic growth; its institutions are the reflex and expression of national character in its relation to national needs; its activities are the outcome of individual initiative working towards common ends. Where the State is the living embodiment of the commonwealth, its institutions will derive their origin and strength from the will of the people rather than from the authority of the Government. Where the recognized object of the State is to assure to its citizens a life 'fit for the dignity of man,' governmental action will be directed not so much to inspiring and regulating individual effort as to facilitating and encouraging it, and to restraining those who, in seeking their own selfish ends, impede the legitimate activities of others and so defeat the purpose for which the community exists.

The difference between States of these two types is exemplified in their attitude towards all the various departments of human endeavour. To those who regard the State as a separate entity, the development of military power is the most important field of national effort; it is, indeed, an end in itself, the aggrandisement of the political unit being the supreme object of Government. In the same way, their conception of commercial prosperity is expressed in terms of total national output and national income. They value trade and industry mainly for the resources which they place at the disposal of the State. They value the arts and sciences mainly as an adornment to the dignity of the State or as contributing to the increase of its power and wealth. To those, on the other hand, who think in terms of national life, military power is not an end to be sought, but the means whereby national institutions may be preserved, the freedom of internal development secured, and the nation enabled to discharge its obligations to the world at large. They measure commercial prosperity, not by the volume of imports and exports or the sum total of the national capital, but by the standard of life amongst the mass of the people, and by the conditions of their employment. In other words, they apply to trade and industry, as to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, a standard based not on the quantity of things

produced but upon the manner in which they affect human life, by adding to its amenities or giving scope for the natural instinct of creation and service.

If we accept these conceptions—the conception of the nation as a community having for its purpose the development and enrichment of individual life, of the State as the instrument of the communal purpose, and of industry, trade, art and science as a form of service to the community or an expression of human personality—we may deduce therefrom certain fundamental principles to guide us in the work of reconstruction.

In the first place, it is evident that our greatest need is a renaissance, a quickening, of the national spirit, rather than a mere reconstruction of national institutions. For national life is not a 'temple made with hands,' the bricks and mortar of which we may shift about at our pleasure, but a living organism, the members of which are men and women. Before we frame a national programme we have to decide on a national policy, a definite expression of our attitude and purpose with regard to the future of this country.

In the second place, both this policy itself and the programme in which it is embodied must consider the life of the nation as a whole and of the individuals composing it also as a whole. We must neither divide the community by sectional barriers which limit the obligations of any class to the community or of the community to any of its members, nor divide human activities into watertight compartments and attempt to deal with work as divorced from life.

Thirdly, the process of reform must involve the intelligent, voluntary, cooperative activity of all classes and all sections of the population. The attempt to impose a reformation by the authority of the State is doomed to failure. It may produce an imposing organisation, but it will be fatal to the initiative and sense of responsibility which are the vital principle of national life. The task of Government is to facilitate and encourage development, to clear away the obstacles presented by past mistakes and adverse conditions, and to restrain the antisocial activities of selfish interests. To demand that it should itself prescribe and regulate

every form of national activity is to confound the instrumental functions of the State with that corporate life of which it is the symbol and the trustee.

Finally, the measures of reconstruction must be consonant with the character of the British people and of British institutions. Our policy will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. We shall beware of breaking the current of national life, and shall forget neither the circumstances of the present, nor our responsibility to the future, nor our heritage from the past. Since we aim at organic development rather than at mechanical organisation, we shall proceed rather by way of experiment, discussion and education, than by the establishment of a rigid and uniform code. So long as there is unity of spirit we shall welcome diversity of means.

These, then, are the fundamental principles of our policy—to aim at the enrichment of the national life rather than at the mere perfecting of political or industrial machinery; to consider the life of the nation and that of the individual as one indivisible whole; to seek for progress rather by way of cooperative effort than by State compulsion; and to reject the lure of theoretical perfection in favour of natural and organic development. But before proceeding to apply these principles, it is necessary to examine the conditions in which we have to work, and the special problems presented by the circumstances of the moment. Our survey of these conditions must necessarily be very brief, but a few words will serve to remind us of some of the more salient difficulties of our task.

In the first place, the strain imposed by abnormal exertions during the war will almost certainly be followed by a reaction; and the special emphasis necessarily laid on national service in the military sense may have obscured in some quarters the equal importance of civic obligations. There is a distinct danger that the nation as a whole may be inclined to rest on its laurels; and this danger is emphasised by the economic situation with which we shall be faced. For a considerable period after peace is signed there will be a world-wide shortage of food, of manufactured products and of transport. It is probable that the hardships involved will be less patiently

borne and the exertions required less readily made than has been the case under the stimulus of war. Yet, whatever view we take of commercial prosperity as a national aim, these exertions must be great if we are to avoid such a reduction in the standard of life as will bring it below the minimum demanded by social wellbeing.

This period of shortage may necessitate the continuance, in some measure, of that tendency to centralised authority and State control, which has been forced on us by the necessities of the war. While there are many who regard this centralisation and regulation as a purely emergency measure, and believe that, even as an emergency measure, it has been carried too far, there are others among whom the idea of the scientifically organised State as the basis of national life has taken deep root, and their attitude towards reconstruction is coloured by this belief. In the industrial sphere, direct, centralised State control has resulted in unceasing friction with both employers and employed, yet there are large sections of both parties whose hope for the future lies in capturing the State machine for their own purposes.

It must be borne in mind that such designs are by no means impossible of attainment. Under any system of government, the power of great organised aggregations of Capital and Labour must be immense; and the supremacy of the State machine is quite compatible with its subservience to sectional interests. Even during the war, we have seen the food policy of the German Government deflected by the pressure of the agrarian interest; and at no time in recent years has the conduct of our own affairs been wholly free from the influence of vested interests and financial groups, or the threat of the political strike.

So far as Labour is concerned, the tendency to use industrial organisation to obtain political ends has been accentuated by the influence of the Russian revolution on political ideas in this country. The discontent engendered by the operation of war measures and not rendered less formidable by being driven underground, and the contrast between the idealistic character given at the outset to the war and its apparent lack of clear expression in the published war aims of the Allies, have combined with the impatience natural to democracies to

give a strong support to the Russian plea for direct Labour control of national policy.

This reflex action of the Russian revolution has an intimate connexion with the general problem of Labour unrest. The essence of that problem is not to be found in simple questions of wages or works organisation, but in the fact that a large section of the population are not conscious of full participation in the life of the community. They contend, on the one hand, that they do not receive their proper share either of the material wealth or of the social amenities arising from the common effort, and, on the other hand, that they have no adequate opportunity in their daily life for the full exercise of their faculties or the expression of their personality. The result is that many of the most intelligent limit their conceptions of corporate responsibility to their own class, and either deny any obligation to the nation as a whole, or regard all who are outside their own class as parasites on the State. It may be doubted whether the mere inclusion of a larger number of these people as quinquennial voters will afford that measure of participation in the national life which they demand. It is still more doubtful how their attitude will affect their use of the vote.

The industrial aspect of reconstruction is further complicated by the pledges given to the Trade Unions, and the general recognition that literal fulfilment of those pledges is a physical impossibility. It will be necessary to devise an equivalent; and an equivalent, if it is to be genuine, must be not merely equal in value to the thing for which it is a substitute, but must be recognised as such by those to whom it is proposed. An enforced settlement, however beneficial, is no fulfilment of the contract. The equivalent for any feature of the *ante-bellum* conditions which it may prove impossible to restore must either be suggested by the workers themselves, or at least placed before them with absolute liberty of discussion, amendment or rejection.

Such are the conditions in which we are to set about our task. We may sum them up very briefly as reaction from the stimulus of war, the probability of an economic crisis, a conflict between the advocates and opponents

of centralisation and State control, the increasing influence of financial and industrial interests on political action, the demand of Labour for fuller participation in the fruits of the common effort, the repudiation by some sections of Labour of all obligations to the State as at present constituted, the obligation of the State to fulfil its pledges to the Unions.

It would be interesting to examine each of the various programmes of reconstruction which have been put forward, in the light of these conditions and of the principles we have attempted to define. Unfortunately, such an examination would make impossible demands upon our space, and we must perforce confine ourselves to a consideration of the chief general tendencies revealed. This is the less to be regretted, inasmuch as most of the programmes fall into three or four groups having a strong family likeness.

The main lines of cleavage are two—one relating to purpose and the other to method. With regard to purpose, the distinction is between those whose criterion of national prosperity is based on things, and those whose criterion is based on lives. With regard to method, the divergence is between those who look for progress to the extension and perfection of compulsory organisation, and those who place their hopes in spontaneous individual activity and voluntary cooperation. The believers in compulsory organisation may be subdivided into those who favour the centralisation of control over all forms of national activity in the State, and those who desire to invest specially created functional bodies, such as Guilds or Trade Councils, with authority to regulate and control specific departments of national life.

To some extent, these lines of demarcation cut across each other. Those who measure the greatness of a nation by the extent of its political boundaries and its military power, those who judge of its prosperity by trade statistics and volume of production, are naturally to be found almost unanimously on the side of centralised authority and regulation, whether by the State or by functional groups. Among those whose object is to improve the standard and quality of life, there is greater difference of opinion. Many of them believe that their end can only be attained by a concentration of power

in the hands of centralised authorities under democratic control. Others regard the tendency to transfer initiative from men to systems as the chief obstacle to progress.

Among the advocates of centralisation and regulation are to be found those who have been converted by the war to the supremacy of the scientifically organised State. The pessimists with regard to international relations—those who deny the possibility of a league of nations, and who regard international trade as a form of conflict rather than of cooperation—are naturally led to the adoption of a military model for national institutions. Regarding all forms of human activity as phases of a ruthless struggle for existence, which finds its ultimate expression in the conflict of nations, they inevitably tend to subordinate individual freedom and social welfare to the development of the power and resources of the State.

In the same camp are to be found those who may be termed the Scientific Industrialists. Under this heading we include the authors of all those programmes of industrial reconstruction which lay a preponderant emphasis upon the systematic organisation of industry for mass production and regard quantity of output as the sole, or at any rate the chief, criterion of national vitality. Many of them pay lip-homage to the life-standard, by claiming that the adoption of their proposals would enable higher wages to be paid; and it is probable that they will thereby purchase a certain amount of Labour support. Nevertheless, the bias of their outlook is recognisable in a general tendency to consider work simply as a commodity and the worker as an industrial unit. They accept, in general, a purely material standard of national welfare; and, even when they propose to admit the worker to some share in the control of industry, they stop short of recognising that he has any interest in his job other than the money which he earns. Hence, in their schemes of industrial reorganisation, the individual, whether employer or operative, is nothing, the system is everything. Their tendency to regard industry as an independent entity, separable from the social life of the community, leads them, in many cases, to demand for it an autonomous constitution; but the powers with which they would invest the central

industrial authorities are hardly less than those claimed for the State by the most fervent advocates of centralisation. Their ideal appears to be the conversion of the whole country into one vast factory, ruled by a board of experts on the lines of scientific management.

At the opposite pole to the supporters of State supremacy and the Scientific Industrialists are the Localists, who deny that any real communal bond can extend beyond the village or the small town, and the advocates of Industrial Reintegration, who dream of abolishing the whole industrial system, and reverting to the small workshop and universal hand-labour. Both these groups base their arguments on the sanctity of personality and the necessity for individual freedom of initiative and expression; but, as has already been said, there are other groups adopting the life-standard, who seek to attain their ends by centralised organisation. Such are the State Socialists, who desire to bring all property and all forms of activity under direct State control on the ground that economic equality is a condition precedent to all moral and intellectual progress; and the Guild Socialists, who would hand over the regulation of industry to autonomous functional units, invested with authority coequal with that of the State.

It is State Socialism which has been adopted as the official policy of the Labour Party. Among the rank and file of the workers there is a strong disruptive tendency, which is equally hostile to the employers, the State and the recognised Labour organisations. This movement, which finds one expression in the increasing influence of Shop Stewards, aims at direct Labour control of each separate industrial concern, but its final goal is not very clearly defined. Meanwhile, the leaders of the existing Labour Party, whose outlook extends beyond the purely industrial sphere, are bent upon capturing the State machine. Their experience of State management during the war has rendered them violently hostile to the present constitution of Government; yet their latest demand is for the nationalisation of land, railways, coal mines, shipping, power stations, and the business of Life Assurance, together with State control over the import of raw materials, the machinery of production and distribution, prices, wages and profits. They are content

that the State should control all national activities, provided that Labour controls the State. It is worth noting that the advocates of State Supremacy, the Scientific Industrialists and the Labour Party, alike demand the centralised organisation of all forms of industrial activity. Their only quarrel is as to who shall control the machine and how the proceeds shall be divided.

What measure of support this programme will receive it is too early to say; but there is no doubt that its appeal will be strong. The Marxian Socialism of the Social Democratic Party, based on the 'class war,' has never made great progress in this country; but the nationalisation of the means of production and distribution, and the gradual expropriation of the individual capitalist are widely advocated, both on grounds of natural justice and as the only effective means of securing to the workers greater leisure, better education, wider opportunities, surroundings more congenial to personal development, and conditions which shall change work from a mechanical drudgery into a fitting expression of human powers. The necessity of such a policy is preached in popular terms by the Independent Labour Party and on more academic lines by the Fabian Society. These bodies now appear to have won over the Trade Union Congress—hitherto mainly concerned with concrete questions of wages and working conditions—and the extension of the New Labour Party to include brain-workers has brought in a powerful reinforcement from among those who conceive that the present constitution of society presents insuperable obstacles to the raising of the standard and quality of life amongst the mass of the people. Believing that these obstacles can be swept away by legislative reforms, many who do not belong to the working class in the ordinary acceptance of the term, hope to accomplish these reforms by means of a Labour Government.

A different tendency from any of the above is represented by such documents as the Whitley Report and the Garton Memorandum. The authors of these documents accept the existing constitution of industry and society, but desire to transform it by the introduction of a new spirit, finding expression in the voluntary cooperation of employers and employed, for the purpose of

securing both better methods of production and an improvement in the status and wellbeing of all those connected with industry. This cooperation they propose to obtain through the medium of Joint Standing Industrial Councils, District Boards and Works Committees, representative of the existing Trade Unions and Employers' Federations. The distinguishing feature of the schemes is that the work of establishing this new machinery is left to the spontaneous initiative of those concerned, with the widest liberty of experiment and variety.

There are few of these groups whose creed does not contain certain valuable elements of truth; and, if the work of reconstruction is to be truly national, the co-operation of those who differ on many points of detail will be required. There is no single specific for social or industrial ills; and it will be a deplorable misfortune if mutual suspicion, or too rigid an enforcement of party shibboleths, prevents men who agree in desiring their country's good from working together to procure it. There is, however, one question which is fundamental and which must be faced at the outset. This is the question at issue between those whose criterion of national prosperity is 'efficiency'—whether shown by trade statistics or by the power and smooth working of the State machine—and those whose criterion is the standard of individual life and service.

This word 'efficiency' is one of those popular catch-words which do much to obstruct clear thinking on any subject. Meaning much or little according to their employment, they are readily adopted as a cheap and easy substitute for thought, and lend themselves without difficulty to interested interpretations. They are too dangerous to be allowed to pass without examination.

The defect of 'efficiency' as a programme is that it has no positive existence. It is a purely relative quality and can be considered only in relation to purpose. It pertains to the instrument and not to the function of the instrument. An institution may be very efficient in performing the work for which it was created, and yet be a curse and a snare, all the more deadly because of that very efficiency.

Our apostles of efficiency would doubtless disclaim the worship of power as divorced from purpose; but there is visible in all their utterances a disquieting tendency to blind admiration of mere accomplishment, irrespective of the value of what is accomplished. This is an age of machinery; and the test of a machine is how it does its work and how much it does in a given time. But the test of human life is not merely how much a man does, but what he does, and how it affects him. The test of any human institution is not the volume of its accomplishment but the value of its accomplishment to humanity. Those who urge us to make great sacrifices and exertions in order to attain a certain end must tell us not only how that end is to be attained, but why we should desire to attain it.

It is just that question 'why,' which the apostles of efficiency seldom care to answer. Or if they do answer it, they answer it in a manner which is no answer at all, by the plea of 'necessity.' For it is precisely those who believe most in the merit of efficiency who deny our power to choose the goal at which we aim. In regard to accomplishment they set no bounds to human capacity; in regard to purpose they are fatalists.

Thus we are told that our traditions of civic liberties, of individual initiative, of high-quality production, must be laid aside if they interfere with the scientific organisation of the State machine or the maximisation of output. We are told that we must adopt German methods in order to meet German competition, that education must be subordinated to the technical requirements of industry, that the individual trader must be crushed out or absorbed by the great syndicates and combinations, that the work of the operative must necessarily become more and more mechanical. In each case, the reason given is that these developments are in accordance with the tendencies of modern progress, or that they are necessary to the political power of the State or the maintenance of commercial supremacy. Those who write in this strain often deplore the fact that political idealism, humanistic culture, the personal element in trade and industry, and the gratification of æsthetic demands, are incompatible with the relentless competition of modern life; but they have no doubt of the

fact and no doubt that the fact forms a sufficient justification for the sacrifice.

The truth is that this so-called 'necessity' is an arbitrary assumption which ignores the fundamental question involved. In every case this question is one of comparative values; and, until the values have been compared, the necessity must not be presumed. Before we consent to sacrifice the individual to the smooth working of the State machine, we must be satisfied that the power of the State is of greater value than the lives of the people. Before we are asked to sacrifice the freedom of the trader, beauty or high quality of production, variety of products and the self-respect of the worker, to trusts, mass production and maximum output, we must be satisfied that commercial success is of greater value than social welfare, and that the production of the greatest possible number of articles at the lowest possible cost is the true criterion of commercial success. The answers to these questions are not axiomatic. In each case they involve a choice which, as individuals and as a community, we are free to make; and we cannot shuffle off our responsibility by pleading that we are powerless to resist the blind natural forces of time and change.

If we accept the conceptions of national life outlined above, there will be no doubt as to our answer. The purpose of the State is to safeguard the natural evolution of national institutions and traditions, and to secure the full participation of the individual in the life of the community. The purpose of all human institutions is to provide full opportunities for the exercise of the creative and receptive powers of the individual. The purpose of commerce is to minister to the fulness of human life. In each case the apostles of efficiency ask us to abrogate the purpose in order to perfect the instrument.

The objection may be made that, unless the State machine is rendered efficient by its reorganisation on the German model, it will be powerless to fulfil its purpose of representing us adequately in the councils of the world. Even if this were so, many of us would reply that the purpose for which the State exists is equally defeated if, in the pursuit of power, we suffer the institutions which it embodies to be corrupted, and the internal

development, with the protection of which it is charged, to be arrested. Moreover, the reply is false in fact. No perfection of State machinery can preserve the life of a nation if the animating principle of voluntary devotion and civic obligation is wanting; and the most imperfect machinery may serve its turn if the pulse of the nation beats strongly and healthily. It was not the imperfection of administrative machinery but the decay of civic virtue that overthrew the Roman Empire. We too desire to see the State efficient for the performance of its task. We desire to see the defects which the war has revealed in our administrative machinery made good. But we believe that the strength of British institutions lies in their power of calling out the spirit of voluntary devotion in the citizens, and that the imposition of an alien system of centralisation, regimentation and bureaucratic supervision, would end, however perfect its mechanism, in destroying the vital principle of the whole.

So with questions of trade and industry. We are told that if, through our characteristic individualism, through our refusal to meet the demand for cheap, low-quality goods, or through attaching too much importance to æsthetic and social considerations, we allow other nations to surpass us in total output or total export per head of the population, our trade will not only stand still but recede, until a point is reached at which it fails to provide that minimum standard of material wellbeing without which mental or moral progress is impossible. This is simply the application to international trade of the modern commercial maxim, 'Get on or get out,' and it is marked by pretty much the same fallacies. The man of varied interests, to whom money-making is an incident rather than a pursuit, may not make so large a fortune as the man who subordinates the enjoyment of riches to their accumulation, and regards profit and not service as the sole criterion of success; but he does not necessarily starve. As a matter of fact, the influence of idealism is not inevitably detrimental to commercial success. Well-paid labour is usually more profitable to the employer than ill-paid labour; and competition in quality is generally more effective than competition in price.

But, even if the subordination of economic to social

considerations is admitted as a handicap in the struggle with foreign competition, the suggestion that the choice lies between commercial supremacy (as indicated by export figures) and economic ruin will not bear examination. It rests on the assumption that the demand of the world for goods is fixed and limited, and that no nation can increase its exports except at the expense of another. It assumes, further, that this demand is indivisible, and that it is necessary to compete for the supply of shoddy in order to sell broad-cloth; or else that the lower-grade or standardised product will inevitably oust the higher grade or individualised product from the market; all of which assumptions are demonstrably untrue or true only to a very limited extent. Moreover, it ignores altogether the home market, the fact that five-sixths of our production is for consumption and not for export. So far as our essential imports of food and raw materials are concerned, it must not be forgotten that those who desire to sell to us must necessarily take our own products in payment. The nature of the home demand will be conditioned by our view of the qualities which are desirable in production; and, so far as concerns the exports necessary to pay for our requirements from abroad, the fear of such a reduction in the demand for characteristic British products as will seriously affect the exchanges against us is more imaginative than practical. It must be added that success in international competition which adds to the total national income, but leaves the inequality of its distribution unaffected, affords a very indifferent criterion of national wellbeing.

Since the plea of overmastering necessity breaks down on examination, we are free to judge the various proposals put forward on their merits, and to apply to them our own criterion—that of their bearing on the quality of individual life. Tried by this standard, all schemes which are based on a rigid, uniform system of State Control must be condemned. Their deadly uniformity is fatal alike to the variations of local custom and individual character which help to preserve national life from stagnation, and to the license of experiment which is the only means of putting innovations to the test of experience. Their transfer of initiative from the

individual to the State is fatal to the development of decision, responsibility and personal character among the citizens. We lay no less stress than the followers of Treitschke on civic obligations; but, if the fulfilment of those obligations is to involve any real participation in the life of the nation, it must be voluntary and spontaneous. Resort to compulsion may be necessary in the case of those who persistently defraud the community by evading their obligations of service, not merely in the military sense. But the acceptance of compulsion as a last resort and its adoption by preference as a principle, are two very different things.

It is chiefly for this reason that we distrust the doctrines of the State Socialists. Their proposals are animated, it is true, by the desire to ensure a fuller and richer life for the mass of the people. They claim that only by the State assuming, as trustee for the people, possession of the machinery of production and exchange, can these be prevented from falling into the hands of a favoured few, and that only through State action can the people acquire any real control over the conditions of their employment. It may be doubted, however, whether the participation in control thus conferred would amount to very much in the case of the individual, and whether the triumph of State Socialism would not involve the risk of a bureaucratic tyranny as fatal to individual responsibility and freedom as Prussian Militarism itself. In the organised Socialist State there would be no room for minorities; and, where there is no room for minorities, there is little hope of development. We may doubt, too, whether the supporters of State Socialism do not place altogether too much faith in legislation as a method of reform. They are right in claiming that it lies within the province of the State to exercise a veto, in the interests of social welfare, over all forms of activity by which that welfare may be impaired. But the good which can be accomplished by legislation is chiefly negative. You can forbid a man to do wrong; you can even place him among surroundings which provide him with the opportunity to do right; but you cannot equip him by law with vigour, personality and ideas. And to these things an atmosphere of systematic regulation is not conducive.

Those whom we have termed the Scientific Industrialists are, as we have seen, generally opposed to direct State control of industry. They include a certain number of employers who maintain that the unfettered authority of the experienced business man, freed from legislative interference and secured against the pretensions of Labour, is the only guarantee of successful commercial effort, and is, in the long run, beneficial to the workers themselves. By the more progressive members of the group, however, this claim to autoocracy is abandoned; and several schemes for the reorganisation of industry on the lines of an autonomous development have been drawn up. The ablest of these was published as a manifesto by the Council for the Study of Industrial Reconstruction, and suggested the setting up of a Government Department for the promotion of trade, and the creation by this Department of Trade Councils, to whom the control of each trade and industry should be handed. Both employers and employed were to be represented on these Councils, by means of a vocational franchise; and the welfare of the workers was placed on the list of subjects for which special departments were to be created, though not very high on the list.\*

Here we have a representative programme palpably inspired by an honest desire to improve the status of industry as well as to increase the annual volume of production and export. It suffers, however, from two grave defects. In the first place, it makes far too little provision for the representation of other than economic interests. It must be admitted that in any scheme of industrial organisation it is difficult to afford adequate protection to the consumer and to the social interests of the community, or to guard against the danger of these vast organisations exercising undue pressure on the State. This objection is recognised by the advocates of voluntary Joint Standing Councils, on the lines of the Whitley Report, as equally applicable to their own proposals; and they have not as yet found a completely satisfactory solution. Nevertheless, it must be said that the whole tone of the programme under consideration shows too great a tendency to regard industry as a

---

\* See 'Westminster Gazette' of Oct. 11, 1917.

separate entity, and to regard the interests of those engaged in it as confined to profits and wages.

In the second place, the scheme, like all those of the Scientific Industrialists, is based on the adoption of a rigid compulsory code, with all the disadvantages that attach to the substitution of a mechanical system for individual initiative. It must be put into force as a whole or not at all, and leaves no room either for dissentients or for experiment. It suffers, in fact, from the logical perfection of paper constitutions. The most representative British institutions are things of organic growth, not systems worked out in the study and imposed by a single legislative act. Moreover, the compulsory subordination of the existing Labour organisations to any new controlling bodies would raise in an acute form the question of the pledges given to the Trade Unions.\*

There are two or three typical features which mark almost all that is written by the Scientific Industrialists on the subject of reconstruction. They lay great stress on the desirability of Technical Education; they are advocates of scientific management and mass production; they are fond of alluding to our unexhausted reservoir of woman power. In all these tendencies there is an element of danger.

An improvement in our methods of technical education is an admitted necessity, though its value at an early age is at least doubtful. We shall do well, however, to regard with grave suspicion all attempts to subordinate general education to vocational instruction. The purpose of education is to fit children and adolescents for their lives as men and women, as loyal and intelligent members of the community, not merely to supply employers with handy operatives or capable clerks.

Again, so far as scientific management implies simply the elimination of waste in material or effort, and the selection of particular men for particular jobs according to capacity and preference, it is wholly beneficial. But in practice its effect is frequently to reduce the worker

---

\* Since this article was written, this programme appears to have been abandoned by the Council in favour of a frank acceptance of the proposals of the Whitley Report; but the original manifesto was typical of a line of thought which is becoming increasingly common.

to a mindless automaton set in motion by the expert. This result is not a necessary outcome of the system. It is the outcome of preconceptions, under the influence of which the sole interest of the community in production is held to reside in quantity of output, the sole interest of the employer in profit, and the sole interest of the worker in wages. But that outlook is shared by so many advocates of the system, that the suspicion with which it is regarded by Labour, with its increasing demand for responsibility and self-respect in the conditions of employment, is no matter for surprise.

The standardisation of products and mass production may also have their value in providing indispensable necessities at a moderate cost; but it is impossible to regard them as an industrial ideal, except on the assumption that the quantity of things produced is the supreme test of human effort. 'In manufacturing, the great points are quantity and uniformity—the production over and over and over again of the same identical article. This permits organisation in men, methods and machinery.' Yes, but it degrades the worker into an automaton, and deprives him of that pride in his work which alone can make it a fitting expression of his powers, while it robs the product of all human interest or æsthetic value. Whatever use we make of it, especially in meeting the *post-bellum* crisis, we must not erect it into a principle of our national renaissance.

It has been impossible to do more than indicate a general standpoint with regard to these very important matters, and it is equally impossible to argue here the great question of female labour. But there is one thing that must be said. There are social considerations of the gravest importance concerned in the question, to which full weight must be given. To regard the womanhood of this country as a mere reserve of labour-power is to misapprehend the nature of national life.

There is little room left to discuss the programmes of the other groups which have been named, but many of them fall, at least to some extent, within the scope of the considerations already urged. To the Guild Socialists and the Reintegrationists all honour is due for their witness to the dignity of labour and its rank as

a personal service to the community. But the programme of the Reintegrationists, with its abandonment of machinery and organisation, hardly falls within the sphere of practical politics as a measure for general adoption; and the proposals of the Guild Socialists are exposed to two dangers—that of setting up the tyranny of system within the industry, and that of investing functional units, dealing with man in only one of his phases, with power properly belonging only to the community as a whole. Of the Localists, as well as of those sections of Labour who restrict their recognition of obligations to their own class, it must be said that their denial of the national nexus reveals an imperfect appreciation of forces which have a very real existence, and impoverishes the life of the individual by an arbitrary circumscription of his outlook. The strong point of their case is their recognition of the fact that the sense of civic responsibility must at least begin with participation in the direction of those activities which intimately concern a man in his daily life, and that the mere exercise of a quinquennial vote in an electorate of millions will not suffice for the discharge of his obligations.

On the whole, the Whitley Report and the other proposals discussed in connexion with it come nearest to the ideal we have framed for ourselves. They regard work as a form of service rather than as a commodity; they lay greater stress on the status and responsibility of the workers than on total output or even on rates of wages; and they base their schemes of reconstruction on voluntary cooperation. Their purview, however, is limited to the industrial sphere; and it cannot be said that they have fully recognised the connexion between industrial and social problems on the one hand and political on the other.

In all these groups and schemes we have found elements necessary to any full conception of national life, and suggestions for the task of reconstruction or the guidance of the renaissance. None of them, however, if taken alone, fulfils the requirements of our touchstone, or affords a means of dealing with all the problems of the *post-bellum* situation. We shall be doomed to disappointment if we expect to construct for ourselves a programme that will accomplish these ends. The real

question we have to face is: 'How can we best ensure the full and conscious participation of every citizen in the national life?' And this cannot be achieved by legislation.

It is far more difficult to recognise and accept the obligation which lies upon each one of us to contribute to the reshaping of the national life than to throw the burden upon Government and demand the passing of an Act, or to accept some single institution or reform as the cure for every evil from which we are suffering. The tendency to discharge our obligations thus vicariously will be very strong in the reaction following the strain of the war. Nevertheless it must be withstood.

We shall not be saved by systems. What is wanted is a conscious and sustained effort of national service on the part of each one of us. If we wish to take part in this revival we must be humble. It is not for those in power to 'use their influence,' nor for intellectuals to 'point the way,' but for each of us to contribute what we can, in thought or deed, recognising our fallibility and striving rather to stir others to thought and action than to impose on them our own conceptions.

From this it follows that the purpose of this paper is not to put forward a programme, but to plead for a full consideration of policy and purpose before we are committed too deeply to any line of action. Nevertheless, there are certain considerations with regard to particular problems which seem to spring naturally from the principles and conditions we have been investigating; and to an examination of these the second part of this paper will be devoted.

C. ERNEST FAYLE.

## Art. 8.—CHURCH REFORM.

1. *Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State.* S.P.C.K., 1916.
2. *Royal Letters of Business—Resolutions of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury.* S.P.C.K., 1917.
3. *Memorandum of the Council of the Churchmen's Union on the Report of the Archbishop's Committee.* Privately printed, 1918.
4. *The things that are Cæsar's, and The Genius of the English Church.* By Alfred Fawkes. Murray, 1917.
5. *Reform or Revolution in the Church of England.* By W. W. Jackson. Oxford University Press, 1917.
6. *The Church in the Furnace.* Edited by F. B. Macnutt. Macmillan, 1917.
7. *Can England's Church win England's Manhood?* Edited by Bishop Gwynne. Macmillan, 1917.
8. *The Revenues of the Church of England.* By A. C. Headlam. Murray, [1917].
9. *The Church in the Commonwealth.* By Richard Roberts. Headley Brothers, 1917.

THE report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State marks, though it does not make, a crisis in our history. For it gives official sanction to the oft-repeated protests of thinking men against the deadlock which has resulted from three centuries of political change and of ecclesiastical inertia; it supplies materials, important though not sufficient, for a reasoned judgment on the whole situation; and it offers a systematic proposal for such reforms as may restore the Church of England to efficiency. The Committee may well feel encouraged by the manner in which their report has been received. For the first time within living memory a substantial plan of Church Reform has evoked widespread interest and occasional enthusiasm.

There are some Churchmen and many Nonconformists who condemn the Report on the ground that 'spiritual independence' is destroyed by connexion with the State. One of these critics tells us that 'the prevailing religion of State Churches is a polite paganism touched here and

there by a Christian grace.\* This is not the place to argue that question. But an admirable answer to the disestablishers is to be found in Mr Fawkes' brilliant and stimulating book on 'The Genius of the English Church.' The critics who really matter are those who approach the Report with some degree of sympathy. Many such, while grateful to the Committee for their scheme, are still more grateful to them for opening a way which may lead to reforms much larger and more hopeful. They desire that the Church of England shall be freed from the fetters which now check her power of service, but not from the venerable ties which unite her to the whole nation. The two main tests, therefore, which they apply to the Scheme are: (1) Does it give promise of a fuller spiritual life? and (2) Will that life be shared by the nation as a whole?

Before we search the Report for answers to these questions—a task of no little difficulty, since it is a strangely confused and inconsistent document—we must remark upon an assumption which colours its language in many places. For assumptions are subtle things, which act powerfully by repeated suggestion; and this particular assumption is of great importance, because it not only underlies but undermines the Report.† If the connexion between Church and State is at best an evil, which may be minimised but never neutralised, the reader may well ask why the Committee have proposed a plan for its continuance. The reason is that the plan was deliberate, while the assumption was in the main unconscious. One example of this bias may be quoted. The terms of their reference instructed them

'to inquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion.'

The Report opens with a confession (p. 3) that only one half of the task has been attempted. 'We have concentrated our attention on devising means for this free action of the Church.' That sentence describes a

---

\* Roberts, 'The Church in the Commonwealth,' p. 100.

† See 'Memorandum of Churchmen's Union,' p. 2.

solid and useful bit of work, which is carried out in the first fifty-seven pages. But on p. 58 we read :

‘It is now our business to show how this fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church can be made consistent with the national recognition of religion. We shall have done this if we can show that under our scheme the effective power of the State to safeguard itself is completely preserved.’

Quietly, unconsciously, ‘the fuller expression of the national recognition of religion’ is identified with ‘the effective power of the State to safeguard itself.’ Against what? Apparently against the assaults of its natural enemy, the Church! That implication is all that the Committee contributes to the solution of a momentous problem. Surely it is strange that, in a book of three hundred pages, only these two sentences touch the ‘national recognition of religion,’ and touch it only to thrust it out of the way.

The divergence between the reference and the Report is not accidental, but corresponds to a divergence between two conceptions of the Church. The Report takes for granted what is frequently called the Catholic conception, according to which the Church in England is merely a group of dioceses, belonging to the Catholic Church, which happen to be located in England. Being no more than a slice of a larger body, such a group has no organic unity. To call it a national Church is a misnomer, for its forms are not the expression of national religious life, but imposed upon that life by an external tradition. Any claim of the nation to modify them is therefore an intrusion into an alien dominion, an interference with ‘inherent authority.’ In its fulness this conception belongs to the Roman Church, which is really a homogeneous world-wide corporation. The fruits of this conception are such as Bishop Westcott had in view when he wrote, ‘The Church of England cannot, as long as it is national, degenerate like the Roman Church in France into a separate, a rival, an antagonistic society.’\* While obvious facts prevent members of our Church from holding this opinion in its fulness, a similar conception of

---

\* ‘Christian Aspects of Life,’ p. 65.

the Church, which is often expressed by some members of the Committee, influences the tone of their Report. Naturally, those to whom the very idea of a national Church is repugnant see the difficulties of Church and State through a magnifying glass.

Those who formulated the reference were inspired with a larger and nobler conception, which was briefly described by Archbishop Benson when he said, 'The English Church must be the religious organ of the English people.' His lifelong friend, Bishop Westcott, used the same image on a memorable occasion : \*

'If the National Church ceases to be national—national as accepting the pastorate of the whole people, and expressing generally their spiritual convictions—no other Communion can take its place. No other organ can be found through which the nation can declare its faith.'

The same thought is expressed by Mr Fawkes :

'A Church rests upon a broader basis [than a sect]. It is established not because it teaches a particular theology, or possesses a particular succession, but because it represents the best mind and conscience of the community—the working, in philosophical language, of Reason, in religious language, of the Spirit, in the world and among men.' †

What is involved in Bishop Westcott's axiom that the National Church must 'express generally the spiritual convictions of the whole people'? A conception of the Universal Church as vital rather than mechanical in its unity; a picture of the Churches in the several nations as a family of brothers, differing much among themselves, but all bearing the essential features which proclaim their origin; a conviction that a national Church may express the religious character of one nation without ceasing to be a member of 'the mystical body of Christ, which is the blessed company of all faithful people.' The Church of England, then, must—as Archbishop Benson implied—represent the Christianity of the whole nation, including that part of it which is beyond her formal boundaries. Her position

\* Albert Hall meeting (1893). See 'Christian Aspects of Life,' p. 62.

† 'The Genius of the English Church,' p. 69.

of privilege is a trust on behalf of all English Christians,\* for she is maintained in that position by the one body which is authorised to speak for them all.

If we recognise that as a true description of a national Church, we shall feel the unfairness of the Report in some of its references (e.g. p. 26) to Parliament and to other instruments by which the State exercises control. Parliament is not wholly made up of Christians, nor are its members often elected upon religious issues. Yet it is really representative of the whole people in its attitude to religion. Busy, ill-informed about many details, and impatient of technicalities, it is not unfriendly to the national Church. Its failure to satisfy her needs is due neither to ill-will nor to incompetence, and only in part to lack of time. The principal fault lies at another door. Churchmen, having no council of their own in which they can discuss and agree upon a programme, hold their debates in Parliament, which is confused by their dissensions, and bored by the partial and timid character of the reforms which are put forward by some, only to be opposed by others. Even under present conditions a united Church could obtain a large measure of its desires by the old methods.

The State exercises control also by means of Crown patronage and the Courts of Law. Though it makes no definite proposals for abolishing these, the Report disparages them, and fails to acknowledge the benefits which the Church has derived from them. Prime Ministers have shown themselves wiser patrons of bishoprics, for instance, than any synod, caring more for character and ability and less for considerations of party. And the final Court of Appeal, by protecting representatives of each Church party in turn† from the tyranny of a passing majority, has preserved for our Church a freedom of thought and a variety of temperament which make her the envy of other communions. Yet the Report implies that this lay Court of Appeal is a clog upon spiritual liberty. Careful readers will insist upon a definition of the liberty which the authors desire.

\* That is why it is wrong to require 'Qualified electors' to declare that they 'do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England.' Report, p. 41.

† E.g. the Gorham case, the Burnett case, the Wilson case.

For some of us, remembering what fruits of ecclesiastical liberty, when unchecked by any State law, were tasted by Roger Bacon, Savonarola and John Huss, Colenso and Robertson Smith, may well feel that they had 'rather bear the ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of.' Nevertheless 'the ills we have' are many and serious. Even the incomplete catalogue which is implied in the third and fourth sections of the Report must appeal to any fair-minded reader. But the case is, in fact, so much stronger that some attempt should be made to present it as a whole, though in a bare outline.

First, then, as to Doctrine. 'The 39 Articles,' the Report tells us (p. 21), 'constitute, together with the Prayer-book, the formal statement of the Church of England's teaching as recognised by the State.' In other words, the tenure of benefices legally depends upon adherence to the standard of doctrine there set forth; and any open deviation from that standard renders a clergyman liable to penalties. Now, the Prayer-book and the Articles are virtually the same as those which were published in 1563 by the Convocations, which have ever since rested from constructive labours. So there are the arrears of 350 years to make up. During that interval a whole new world of thought has come into our possession. The conceptions of the universe, of God's providence, of the Bible, of man's nature and history, which are now taken for granted by all educated Christians alike, are so different from those which were held by the subjects of Queen Elizabeth that the few who now read the Articles feel like explorers in a strange country, even if they trust the guidance of those text-books which labour to explain away their obvious meaning.

Suppose such a reader turns for comfort to the Prayer-book. Unless his eyes are sealed by custom, he will find many fresh puzzles there. The first ground assigned for Baptism is the story of Noah's Ark. The marriage service holds up the union of Abraham and Sarah as a model, forgetting apparently that Abraham was not only polygamous but deliberately allowed his wife to be taken into the harem of Abimelech. The daily services describe the King's authority in language which, however well suited to Henry VIII, is little better than

mockery when applied to a constitutional monarch. Printed in the morning service, for frequent use, is the Athanasian Creed, whose damnatory clauses so revolt the modern conscience that even its warmest advocates are forced to pretend that they do not mean what they say.

The need of revision is urgent. It is no mere academic question. From all sides, especially from the soldiers, whose minds the military chaplains are exploring, there comes a demand for a plain statement of what the Church really teaches. Within the last few months the Bishops of Oxford and Peterborough have published two admirable little books in answer to the demand. Each of them tells the plain man what the Church really teaches. Unfortunately their statements differ from each other almost as much as they do from the Articles. And, even if they were in agreement, their joint authority could not commit the Church as a whole. Neither could Convocation, if some miracle were to rouse it from its dreams to face realities. Nothing will now satisfy which does not proceed from a really representative body, representing the laity as well as the clergy.

Next, as to Worship. Quite apart from difficulties of doctrine, it has long been apparent that the forms of the Prayer-book are unsuited to the great majority of worshippers. Educated Churchmen, familiar with its language from childhood, enjoy the stately beauty of its archaic style; but to nine-tenths of our population it is almost as much a foreign tongue as Latin. And, if the poor man masters the language, he finds a fresh obstacle in the substance. Since the reign of Elizabeth the face of English society has completely changed. The bulk of the population belong to classes which did not then exist; but in the unchanging order of daily prayer there is no recognition of their problems, their needs, their temptations. There are no prayers for soldiers and sailors and men employed in dangerous trades, none for those who work in mines or factories, none for the Empire or even for foreign missions. A pervading feudalism puzzles the plain man; the unchristian tone of many psalms shocks him; the morality of some ill-chosen lessons makes him wonder. And suppose a stranger comes to the service—such a man as the Church wants

to win—how will he be affected? Why should access to the Christian fold be made harder by the double fence of Elizabethan language and ancient Hebrew morality?

Such arguments have been repeated year after year without effect.\* Meanwhile earnest parish priests have been introducing irregular services (often unwisely and often in defiance of authority) in hopes of helping such as cannot use the Prayer-book. But now there sounds a new voice which cannot fail to be heard. Two of the books named at the head of this article are written by chaplains at the Front. Good men and true, of different theological schools, they have learned by a unique experience to see the Prayer-book through the eyes of the average man. This is how an open-minded High Churchman sums up his impressions:

‘The Prayer-book as it stands is a volume that serves only those who are highly instructed in the Faith. . . . Hardly a soldier carries a Prayer-book, because there is little in it he can use. We never guessed of old how removed it was from common wants; nor how intellectual are its prayers and forms of devotion. Its climate to the simple ardent Christian is often ice.’ (‘The Church in the Furnace,’ p. 184.)

So chaplain after chaplain protests that our services must be recast if they are ever to become the prayers of the people. If any man still doubts the need of reforms in the constitution of the Church, let him learn from these books—and there are many of them—how the millions hunger for worship which they can understand; and then turn to those timid and trivial suggestions for amendment, which the Convocation of Canterbury has recently published† as the fruit of seven years’ discussion.

To turn next to Discipline. The doctrine of the Church being so uncertain and her forms of worship so little suited to men’s needs, there is little wonder that many of the clergy have taken lines of their own. Discipline has almost disappeared. Moreover, the Church Courts are so constituted that bishops are reluctant to appeal to them; and, until a court has given a decision, the

---

\* See reports of the Church Congress, 1902, pp. 112–115; 1903, pp. 155–168.

† ‘Royal Letters of Business. Resolutions of the Joint Committee.’

mutinous or even vicious incumbent is firmly entrenched behind the parson's freehold.

Lastly, there are problems of Church property which urgently demand a courageous solution. The root of half our evils lies in the fact that the Church has no power to deal with her own endowments. For, in point of law, the endowments of each parish belong not to the Church, but to the parish, and can be enjoyed only by the incumbent, who practically cannot be removed except by voluntary resignation or by death. The resulting scandals, though notorious enough, are not indeed very numerous; and they might be tolerated if the parson's freehold were beneficial to the majority. But, in fact, it is the effect upon the majority which is the main evil. Security is the average man's undoing. There are few incumbents whose work does not deteriorate after ten or twelve years in one place. Except in rare cases it would be far better for the parson to know that he must move at the end of a fixed term of years. A man with popular gifts generally gets many offers of preferment. But a better man, if he happens to fail in one parish, is not likely to get a fresh opportunity. Indeed, the tragedy of the square man condemned to remain for life in a round hole, just *because* he does not fit it, deserves far more attention than it receives. Not only does his personal suffering claim our sympathy; the loss to the Church, caused by his inevitable deterioration and the discouraging effect of his example, is a ground of alarm.

The 'parson's freehold,' in fact, is as great an incubus upon religion as the headmaster's freehold, till about fifty years ago, was upon education. No reform has done more for secondary education than the law which gave the governing body of every endowed school the power to dismiss the headmaster. A far less drastic change—the mere limitation of tenure—would do as much for the Church; for it would solve half the problems of discipline, and would put new life and hope into the rank and file of the clergy. But it cannot be accomplished until the endowments of each diocese are pooled and redistributed upon reasonable lines.\*

---

\* Dr Headlam's valuable little book, though it does not advocate so radical a change as pooling, gives an effective statement of the need for

If space allowed this outline to be filled in, the case for reform would appear much stronger. But even the above bare statement goes far to justify the words which Mr Douglas Eyre, one of the Committee, has added in an Appendix (p. 69): 'I think the Church had far better make up its mind, before Parliament is approached, that it needs an entire reconstruction.' At least many will go so far with him as to say that the Committee's Scheme, with all its merits, is not adequate either to the situation which they have described or to the principles which they have acknowledged.

The main lines of the Scheme are simple, and have been generally approved. The government of the Church is to be, in a modified sense, representative. Existing institutions are to be adapted and developed, and only one quite new one is to be added. This last is, however, very important, being the basis of the whole fabric. Every parish is to have a Parochial Council, elected by the parishioners, men and women alike, who are members of the Church. The incumbent and other resident clergy are to be *ex officio* members; but the laymen will always be a majority. The Parochial Council is to elect lay representatives to the Ruridecanal Conference, where they will sit with the clergy of the Rural Deanery. The laity of this Conference, in turn, is to send representatives to the Diocesan Conference, in a number equal to that of the clergy who sit there. Finally, the lay members of the Diocesan Conference are to elect a number of representatives proportioned to the population of the Diocese, who will form the House of Laymen in the Church Council. The House of Clergy in this Council is to consist partly of *ex officio* members and partly of members elected by the clergy of each archdeaconry. There will also be an Upper House, consisting of the diocesan and other bishops. In fact, the Church Council is a statutory replica of the unofficial body now called the Representative Church Council.

It is proposed that this Church Council shall have power to pass measures dealing with the affairs of the Church; and that such measures, after lying on the

---

reform, and shows how much might be done by a Church Council possessed of real powers.

table in Parliament for forty days without protest, shall become law. Thus Parliament will be spared the labour of discussing details, but will either accept or reject each complete and well-considered measure as a whole.

Of the two intermediate councils little need be said, for little is said in the Report. Ruridecanal Conferences at present have no real work to do; and the scheme gives them no duty except the election of representatives on their Diocesan Conference. But there is one obvious criticism. Why should not women be allowed to be members of these Conferences as well as of the Parochial Councils? There may be good reasons at present for excluding them from the Church Council. But their zeal for religion, their service to the Church, and their knowledge of its working, entitle them to share the deliberations of all the lesser assemblies.

The Diocesan Conferences are just now reorganising themselves, largely for the sake of putting diocesan finance on a better footing. Probably the authors of the Report are wise in reserving suggestions until it appears what functions these bodies find for themselves. The one duty which the Report assigns to them, that of electing representatives on the Church Council, must be regarded as temporary. For a system of indirect election in three stages, though almost inevitable at first, will not be tolerated when once the people begin to take a real interest in the government of the Church. The success of the Scheme will not be assured until there arises a serious demand for direct election to the Church Council. Like various other questions concerning the Conferences, that belongs to the future. For the present the discussion of the Scheme must centre round the Parochial Councils and the Church Council.

The importance of the Parochial Councils is very great; for, so long as election to the higher councils is indirect, it is in the choice of the Parochial Council alone that the ordinary Church member will have any personal interest. Unless these councils have real and important work to do, the best parishioners will decline to serve on them; and, under the system of indirect election, this would be disastrous. For the quality of the persons elected at each stage of the process by which the Church Council is ultimately constituted will depend upon the

quality of the persons elected in the first instance to the Parochial Councils.\*

Two points, then, have to be considered—the franchise in these primary elections, and the functions assigned to the Parochial Councils. The franchise is thus defined :

‘Qualified electors in a parish must be above 21 years of age, and may belong to either sex, provided that they either (1) are actual communicants, or (2) have been baptised and confirmed and are admissible to Holy Communion, and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England.’

Warned by the historic scandals of the Test Act, the Committee have put aside the suggestion of a communicant franchise. They have done wisely. But are they wise in substituting the test of confirmation? They justify it by the assumption (p. 42) that in confirmation alone men and women ‘accept Church membership as a reality.’ While this is all they say in favour of this compromise, several reasons may be urged against it.

(1) The strong prejudice which admittedly exists in the minds of artisans makes it almost impossible for boys, and difficult for girls, to be confirmed after they leave school; so that the great majority of those who are confirmed are presented at the age of thirteen or twelve or even ten. It is mere affectation to speak of such children as ‘having accepted church membership as a reality.’ For quite another reason that description cannot fairly be applied to all members of the well-to-do classes who have been confirmed. It requires almost as much courage in a public-school boy to decline confirmation as in a working lad to seek it. So that, in fact, confirmation is to some extent a class distinction; and awkward inferences might be drawn from the attempt to make it the condition of the Church franchise.

(2) The prejudice mentioned above is not altogether without excuse in history. Originally the laying-on of hands was an essential part of baptism, which was administered only to adults. The two rites are still united by the Eastern Church, which entrusts both to the priest. But the Western Church, reserving one part to the

---

\* ‘Memorandum of the Council of the Churchmen’s Union.’

bishop, was obliged, when infant baptism became the rule, to make confirmation a separate rite, administered at a later age. It would have been well, when the change was made, to insist upon the close connexion of the two rites, and to lay the chief stress upon that which involved a conscious act on the part of the recipient. The course actually taken was the reverse. St Paul's description of adult baptism, as the seal of personal repentance and faith, was unintelligently transferred to the baptism of infants. Our own Church missed the opportunity for revision which the Reformation afforded, and included the traditional view in her catechism. So long as every child is taught that infant baptism is 'a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness' which has made him 'a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,' so long will there be some excuse for the feeling that to be confirmed is a work of supererogation. Such, in fact, is the feeling of millions who claim to be loyal Churchmen. However much we may regret it, we have to deal with facts as they are. And how can the Church refuse her franchise to those whom her own baptismal service pronounce to be 'regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ'? She cannot logically insist upon confirmation as a test until she has revised her definition of the effects which are produced by infant baptism. And who will venture to fix a date for that revision?

(3) How far the other Anglican Churches were influenced by those considerations is a matter of conjecture. But it is certain that no one of them has adopted the confirmation test. Broadly speaking, they admit to the franchise all adults of good character who have been baptised and declare themselves to be members of the Anglican communion. The results are said to be satisfactory; and it would be rash to disregard them.

(4) The adoption of a communicant franchise would alienate many good people from the Church. The Report says, quite truly, that it does not 'destroy the existing rights of such parishioners as are not qualified electors'; and yet the suggested inference is misleading. For the 'unqualified' will certainly not acquiesce in their own exclusion, when the reason assigned is so debateable.

(5) The last clause in the definition of a 'qualified

elector' is indefinite, superfluous, and provocative. What is meant by 'belonging to another religious body'? No explanation is given. If a modern Wesleyan claims, as all Wesleyans of the first generation did, to be a member of the National Church, it will be because he wishes for reunion. And now, when reunion is being seriously advocated in many quarters, why should a new barrier be raised between the Church of England and Non-conformists?

This question of the Franchise is vital. The proposal of the Report means more than appears on the surface. To understand what it involves we must compare three passages which occur in different chapters. On p. 32 we read that the Committee 'desire to restore to the whole body of Church members its original position of authority.' On p. 41 a Church member is defined as an adult who has been baptised and confirmed, etc. Those two statements give the key to an important sentence on p. 3:

'We are sure that nothing but a restoration of self-government to the Church such as we contemplate will enable it to act effectively as the organ of the spiritual life of that great part of the nation which looks to it for guidance and help.'

So 'the Church' means only those who have the franchise, while the great mass of those who fondly believe themselves to be members are only outsiders who 'look to the Church for guidance.' Autocracy in the Church having broken down, the only practical alternative is confessedly some sort of representative government. But what the Committee propose is an aristocracy, of which the basis is partly fictitious and wholly debateable. And that is what they assume to be restoring the original position of the second and third centuries.

Public opinion, which wavered at first, is moving towards a franchise bestowed upon 'all adults who sign a declaration that they have been baptised and that they claim to be members of the Church of England.\* But, if it be so bestowed, will it be exercised? That depends upon the nature of the functions which are to be assigned to the Parochial Councils. If the suggestions made on p. 47 of the Report were to be adopted; if the Parochial

---

\* 'Memorandum of the Council of the Churchmen's Union,' p. 4.

Council were to control the finances and keep the electoral roll; if it had a real share in the patronage and in the ordering of services, and power to levy a voluntary rate—then parishioners would think it worth while to vote at elections and be anxious to serve on a body so important. But, after drawing this fair picture, the Committee entrust its realisation to chance. All the attractive features are omitted from the Enabling Bill, which assigns to the Parochial Council the bare duty of electing representatives to serve on another body, and leaves all the rest of its functions to be determined by the future Church Council. That is like ordering the roof of their house to lay the foundations. If the constitution of these primary assemblies is of so great importance, their powers and duties, as well as the franchise on which they rest, must be defined by an Act of Parliament.

The Church Council has attracted less attention than it deserves, merely because it is a statutory reproduction of the Representative Church Council, with which the public is familiar. But careful observers are aware that a constitution which suits an elderly debating society is not necessarily well adapted for a legislative assembly. They remark that, while the general idea of the Council, described above, is quite acceptable, two of the particular proposals would be fatal to efficiency. These concern the size of the Council and the number of *ex officio* members. Assuming, as the Report does, that the two Lower Houses will usually sit together, they will form a body of 645 members, without any representatives of the Welsh Church. That is just about the size of the House of Commons, which is notoriously unwieldy. But the House of Commons sits for more than half the year; its members mostly know one another; they constantly meet in the lobbies; and they have their own methods of suppressing too exuberant speakers. In an assembly of the same size, meeting only for a short time, consisting mainly of fluent speakers, who are mostly strangers to each other, and subject to no party discipline, what hope would there be of transacting business? Plainly the numbers ought to be reduced; and this can easily be done. The Clerical House, according to the Scheme, contains no less than 117 *ex officio* members, of

whom 91 are archdeacons, and 25 elected by cathedral chapters. In a scheme for representative government, such a proportion of officials is really too great an anomaly to be tolerated. If their number were reduced by two-thirds, and a corresponding reduction made in the Lay House, the assembly would not be too large to get through its work.

What is that work to be? About this, as about some other important matters, the Report is neither clear nor consistent. A doubt sometimes suggests itself whether the able and distinguished men who signed this curious document had really read it through. At least they cannot have compared the five descriptions of the matters with which the Council may deal.

(1) 'The Church Council should be given full power to legislate on ecclesiastical affairs' (p. 49).

(2) 'The Church of England has inherent authority to deal with all matters of doctrine, worship, and ritual' (p. 50).

(3) 'The Council . . . may formulate its judgment by resolution upon any matter concerning the Church of England' (p. 78).

(4) 'Any measure touching doctrinal formulæ . . . shall be initiated only in the House of Bishops' (p. 77).

(5) 'It does not belong to the functions of the Council to issue any statement purporting to define the doctrine of the Church of England on any question of theology' (p. 78).

What does the Report really mean? May the Council deal with questions of doctrine? The first statement confers 'full power' in general; the second expressly claims the right to deal with doctrine;\* the third encourages the Council to exercise that right; the fourth prescribes a somewhat hampering mode of procedure; and then the fifth forbids everything of the kind! Again, may the Council deal with property? Apparently most of the Committee believe that right to be included in 'full power to legislate on ecclesiastical affairs.' But

---

\* So do the Bishop of Oxford (p. 248) and Lord Parmoor (p. 72) in their separate Memoranda. But they seem to make the claim on behalf of 'the Church,' and not of the Church Council. Perhaps a similar distinction is latent in No. 2 above.

Mr Douglas Eyre expressly denies this, and Lord Parmoor does so by implication.

Now, if the contention of pages 444-447 be just, the definition of doctrine and radical changes in the tenure and distribution of endowments are the two essentials of Church reform; and the utterances of a Council which could not deal with them would be little more than empty clamour. As the famous Free Kirk case has shown, the connexion between the definition of doctrine and the control of property is undeniable. The Free Churches have taken warning, and are determined to claim the power of spiritual development which at present belongs only to the Established Church of Scotland. It is, therefore, nothing less than paradoxical that a Bill to confer 'spiritual independence' upon the Church of England should expressly withhold from its governing Council the power to define doctrine. The Convocations, indeed, are to be left in existence, and they have not lost their legal power to define doctrine, though it is somewhat rusty with disuse. But the establishment of a Church Council cannot but render the Convocations as impotent as the *comitia curiata* of early Rome became in the presence of the *comitia centuriata*. Thus, in fact, there will be no organ of the English Church which can perform the function that holds the first place in the plan (p. 36) for reuniting the Churches of Scotland.

Is this really so? Or has provision been made in a curious sentence on p. 78? 'Nothing in this constitution, nor in any proceeding of the Council, shall interfere with the exercise by the Episcopate of the powers and functions inherent in them.' Interrupting, as it does, a business-like statement, this mysterious sentence reminds us painfully of the famous phrase by which Becket nullified his assent to the Constitutions of Clarendon. It has the ring of 'Saving my order.' Now, in the constitution of a representative council, whose work is of great national importance, there is no room for a mysterious reserve. Plain men will insist upon a definition of these 'inherent powers and functions,' and enquire whether they are the same as those now recognised by the law, or whether they cover some new claim, of which the interpretation is left to the future. They

will remember that it was the claim to an inherent power, superseding the law, that ruined the Pope's authority in England, and overthrew the monarchy of the Stuarts.

Let us interpret the paragraph in the most innocent sense, and assume that it is not intended to give bishops alone the power to deal with doctrine. Then the deadlock remains, for the Church has no organ to express her developed faith. Why should such power be denied her? The mutual fears of opposed parties, which knitted an unholy alliance against Prayer-book reform, and long paralysed the Convocation of Canterbury, cannot be the main reason. Rather is it a survival of the mediæval jealousy which forbade the laity to touch the mysteries of doctrine. Such a feeling is implied in the Report; it is openly proclaimed in some clerical assemblies.

Such claims of privilege are out of date, for the laity are no longer in a state of pupilage. The Reformation of the 16th century came when the laity awoke to the fact that they were morally superior to the priests. Still, they were content to leave doctrine in the hands of its traditional custodians. Now a second Reformation is in progress, because the laity feel that intellectually they are more than equal to the clergy. Philosophy and science are almost entirely in the hands of laymen; and many laymen are far more serious students of theology than most of its professed exponents. They are justly impatient of clerical dictation, and resolved to claim a voice in the determination of doctrinal disputes. In one way or another that '*anima Britannica naturaliter Christiana*,' to which so many of our Army Chaplains pay an astonished and reverent homage, must be allowed the suitable means of expression, the denial of which has concealed its true character even from itself. When that is granted, when the Christian laity are actively represented in the councils of the Church, England will wake up to find herself far more truly Christian than she knew.

Some other questions concerning the powers of the Church Council, though important, do not call for a long discussion. The claim that it should have authority to regulate worship and ritual is generally conceded. There is general sympathy, too, with the desire to establish

Church Courts which shall decide ordinary cases of discipline. But the nation would never consent to deny recourse to the Final Court of Appeal. Among the reasons which make it impossible to do away with appeals is a fact which has been noticed above (page 447). Questions of discipline at present almost always involve questions of property. Even if a radical change were made, and the endowments of the Church of England were as much controlled by the Church Council as the funds of a Free Church are by its governing body, there must still be large changes in the law of the land before discipline can be disentangled from property. It would be absurd to legislate for the Church of England on the assumption that a sweeping change is to be made in the law which regulates all corporations.

Individual members of the Committee claim for the Church Council power to control the appointments which are now made by the Crown. Whether the whole Committee agree with them, or not, we find it hard to discover. But the reasons already assigned for disputing that claim will probably be thought sufficient.

The proposals made in the Report for regulating procedure are by no means clear. But one of them, if it is to be understood literally, involves a grave danger. A class of measures, not specified, might (it is suggested on p. 59) be 'dealt with by a Canon,' and so pass into law without any reference to Parliament. Now, in another place (p. 49) we are told that such Canons, having been assented to by representatives of the laity, 'should be regarded as having authority \* over all churchmen'; in other words, a breach of them would render laymen liable to excommunication. Little imagination is required to see what serious conclusions might be drawn. Suppose, for example, such a Canon were to decree excommunication against every man who married his deceased wife's sister, we should at once have a direct conflict between the National Church and the national conscience. But perhaps this danger is remote. For in the Report no provision is made for giving the Church

---

\* In a sketch of a legal constitution the word 'authority' must mean legal authority, for otherwise it has no real sense.

Council the right to make Canons. That right at present rests in the safe hands of Convocation.

All the 'legislative powers' of the proposed Council are, of course, only powers to pass measures which can have no legal validity until they have been sanctioned by Parliament. The general principle laid down in the Report appears to be quite sound. The Church Council is to formulate measures, with the advice of an Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council. When formulated, measures are to be submitted to Parliament, which will either accept or reject them, but will not attempt the task of amendment. The exact procedure must obviously be determined by Parliament itself, so that the object may be fully secured. The Committee, true to its bias, describes that object as 'parliamentary control.' Those who regard establishment with less suspicion prefer to call it 'national cooperation.'

Some active and influential Churchmen are so much in love with the scheme that they are willing to pay the price of disestablishment for the sake of obtaining 'Life and Liberty.' If the contention of this article be just, they make a grave mistake. The proposed constitution, if such counterpoises as Crown patronage, a Court of Appeal, parliamentary determination of the franchise, were removed, would strongly favour the sectarian impulse. For the indirect election of lay representatives would ensure the exclusion of members opposed to the majority; and the dominance of *ex officio* members of the Lower House of Clergy would tend to suppress independence. Now, a sect may be pure and good, but its life is comparatively narrow, its thought contracted, its outlook provincial. England has sects enough; what she needs is a Church which represents and unites the Christianity of the whole people, a Church which is what Burke said it ought to be—the consecration of the State. And what religion needs is not a new 'intensive' and therefore exclusive Church, but an inclusive brotherhood, whose first aim is to advance the Kingdom of God on earth.

M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

## Art. 9.—KEATS AND SIR SIDNEY COLVIN.

*John Keats. His Life and Poetry, His Friends, Critics and After-Fame.* By Sidney Colvin. Macmillan, 1917.

It might seem strange, at first sight, that Sir Sidney Colvin should have chosen as the chief subjects of his work on English literature, two men so unlike as the greatest of our romantic and the most obstinate and exclusive of our classical writers. Keats was a far greater man than Landor; but 'La Belle Dame' itself might almost as easily have been written by Landor as 'Æsop and Rhodope' by Keats. The difference in kind between the two men is as obvious as the difference in rank. The one wrote in the classical manner, at once by instinct, by principle, and by the life-long habit of scholarship. The other, both by nature and by training, lacked the classical instinct for clarity and selection and possessed in abundance the prodigality of phrase and susceptibility of imagination which are the characteristics of the romantic. Yet it is these two poets, apparently as unlike in genius as they were in fate, who have divided between them the chief part of the leisure which Sir Sidney Colvin has been able to give to literature.

Perhaps, after all, there is a link between them which transcends all differences. Sir Sidney Colvin has given even more of his life's work to art than to letters. May not the key to his devotion at once to Landor and to Keats be looked for in this direction? Have we had any two writers who were more conscious than these two that literature is a fine art whose productions are their own end? Milton was, of course, an incomparably greater artist than either; but he thought of himself not as an artist but as a prophet. Pope and Tennyson certainly, in their different ways, were extremely well aware that poetry is an art; but each aimed at producing effects on their readers other than, or additional to, those sought by the pure artist. There is no harm in that; and Tennyson is, of course, an artist of the very first rank. But, though his faults of taste and execution are so few, and those of Keats so many, yet he has not the temperament of an artist as Keats had it. Still less had Keats's contemporaries, Wordsworth and Shelley. An artist's primary instinct is the love of beautiful things and the

desire himself to create them. That instinct was in Keats as it is in few men from the very first; and it was no mere love of an abstract idea of beauty. The arts which, outside their own, most interested both Keats and Landor were those of painting and sculpture, which deal with the visible forms of things, not that other ethereal art of music which seemed the greatest of all to Plato, and I have no doubt to Shelley, just because it does not deal directly with objects of sense at all. The real subjects of Shelley's poetry (as sometimes of Wordsworth's) were ideas, abstractions, the invisible things and persons into which he constantly escaped from the actual men and women, the actual England and Italy, of his unsatisfied experience. Keats, on the other hand, instead of escaping from objects to ideas, habitually turned ideas into objective visions. Shelley's art, in fact, was always in danger from his speculative tendencies. Keats saw thought always clothed in form. His poetry is as strongly allied to painting and sculpture—especially painting—as Shelley's is to music, though he never turned alliance into absorption or confusion as Shelley sometimes did. So with Landor. The best of his work is marked by the strength and beauty, and the restraint of pure form, which are the peculiar notes of great sculpture. Like Keats, he must have visible form; he has no Shelleyan desire to escape into the invisible and immaterial. Sir Sidney Colvin has himself well said of him: 'He had little interest in any ideas but those which could be perfectly grasped and exhibited in precise lineaments like the shapes of antique gods.'

There, then, is the probable link which unites Sir Sidney's double and at first sight dissimilar service. In his private work, as in his official, to say nothing of his happiest friendships, he has loved painting and sculpture and artistry, and served those who shared his love. That service he is continuing in the midst of the present world-cataclysm, in which, as he says in his Preface, age debars him from rendering any effectual war-service. He need have no regrets or scruples. The intellectual life of the country is of necessity sadly impoverished by the imperious demands of the war to which none responded with more instant ardour than those who most loved art and letters. Whether that response was

unconscious instinct, or the fruit of the high lessons learnt in the finest of human schools, or the result of a conviction that for art and letters the very breath of life is liberty, it was freely made, and a proud but heavy price has been paid for it. In a country so indifferent to the things of the mind that the first public buildings it diverts from their ordinary business are the museums of science and art, a veteran of letters can assuredly do no better service in time of war than in helping to keep those things alive. Certainly there will be many fighters at the front and many toilers at desks and in workshops at home who will be grateful to Sir Sidney Colvin for this masterly and authoritative Life of Keats.

Keats is an immortal; and, just for that reason, each new generation will be hungry to hear his voice. But it will not be quite the self-same voice that each hears, any more than Virgil's generation or Dante's could hear the mellowed and ripened sound, rich in a hundred associations, which we hear now. So Sir Sidney's critical study, admirable and delightful as it is, and conclusive for this generation at least, may need to be done again in time to come. But the biography which he has given us is in all likelihood the final one. It is not with Keats as it was with Shakespeare or Milton, the facts of whose lives were left, in large part, to be discovered centuries after their deaths. There is no probability in Keats's case that any new facts of importance remain to be discovered; and with the old it will probably turn out that Sir Sidney has dealt once and for all in this book. In industry and learning, in fine critical perception, sympathy and judgment, in lucidity and distinction of writing, there are in our language very few literary biographies comparable to it. It cannot, of course, pretend to any rivalry with books quickened by the force of personal intimacy. Sir Sidney has only known two persons who ever spoke to Keats. Nor can his book lay claim to the qualities of the best of those masterly studies which are called Johnson's 'Lives.' But among books of its own order—full-dress biographies critical and personal, written in possession of all the material and long after the event—it would be difficult to find its rival.

There is not enough material for a real Life in the case of Shakespeare. Masson made his 'Life of Milton'

an encyclopædia rather than a biography. Pope, amazing as his gifts were, was a very inferior subject to Keats; and, while Sir Sidney Colvin worships Keats (though on this side idolatry), Elwin's feeling for Pope became, as he proceeded in his task, more and more one of dislike and contempt. The latest and best Life of Wordsworth is seriously injured by bad writing and political pamphleteering. Dowden's Shelley suffers from moral special pleading. There is no good Life of Arnold or Browning; and the Life of Tennyson, admirable and invaluable as it is as a source of information, is the work of a son and makes no claim to critical independence. Mr Gosse's Swinburne has also the immense advantage of being written out of personal knowledge; but, after all, Swinburne cannot, any more than Arnold or Browning, claim to rival Keats in interest either as a poet or as a man. On the whole, it is difficult to see which of our greater poets has been so fortunate as Keats in this kind of posthumous friendship.

Sir Sidney states in his Preface that he has had two aims before him, that of 'holding the interest of the general reader,' and that of 'satisfying, and perhaps on some points even informing, the special student.' He has achieved both. The reader of general intelligence, so much more important than any kind of specialist, will find it hard to put the book down, and, when he does, will have learnt a good deal that is worth learning and felt a good deal that is worth feeling. Keats in one way and Shelley in another have perhaps been the most loved, as distinct from enjoyed or admired, of our poets; and Keats even more than Shelley, as being so much more human and so much better known. Shelley was a spirit, and never could be on a perfectly natural footing of truth and daylight with men and women who generally appeared to him either as angels or devils. He was almost as remote from those about him as a saint from his worshippers. Only, happily for us, there was among them one sincere but very profane disciple to whom we owe the amusing and lying legend of the saint known as Hogg's Life. But Keats's friends give us just the truth; and, what is more, he was able, in his abundant and delightfully confessional letters, to give it to us himself.

Sir Sidney Colvin draws freely on these letters to the great advantage of his book. And both with them and with the poems he has the courage and good sense never to shrink from reprinting in his pages the most familiar things. Not every one has a memory, and not every one will at all times leave his chair and interrupt his reading to get a volume from the shelves.

That is the first thing Sir Sidney Colvin has done for the ordinary reader of that not too ordinary sort which really cares for our great poets and their poetry; he has retold the *Life of Keats* with added facts on a larger scale and in a more interesting fashion than it had ever been told before. And the second is that he takes us through the poetry from the earliest to the latest, tells us what is known of the circumstances in which every important poem was written, and gives us abundant help towards its understanding and enjoyment. It is safe to say that 'Endymion' will be read by a good many people this year, who, but for Sir Sidney, would not have read it and would not have understood it if they had. And here we cross the thin boundary line which separates the right kind of general reader from the right kind of special student. The two chapters on 'Endymion,' the first on the source and symbolism of the story and the second on the qualities, affinities, and ancestry of the verse, are admirably addressed to both; that is to say, they are as full of life as of learning and of learning as of life. Sir Sidney does not, of course, go into such details as fill, for instance, the very useful compilation of M. Lucien Wolff on Keats's treatment of blank verse and the rhymed couplet. That would be out of place in a biography; but he gives us enough to stimulate the interest of the general reader and to tell all but those who have made a special study of metre something more than they knew before.

The newest thing in the book is perhaps the study of what Keats's poetry owes to works of art, which Sir Sidney has still further developed in a lecture recently delivered to the English Association. On this subject also his is not the first word to be said and will probably not be the last. But he has obviously special qualifications for dealing with it; and his account of the way in which Keats used suggestions which he caught

from pictures and works of sculpture is not only very interesting in itself, it is a lesson, never unneeded, in the freedom with which all creative artists use their materials. 'Je prends mon bien où je le trouve,' said Molière, and he might have added, speaking not only for himself but for all poets, 'and I deal with it exactly as it suits me.' People insist on fancying that poets copy their predecessors and that novelists photograph individuals. The truth is, of course, that, if they do, they are not artists but mechanics. It is a very useful lesson in criticism which is provided by the page in which Sir Sidney gives his reasons for thinking that the famous description of Bacchus and his rout in 'Endymion' had other sources than Titian's glorious picture in the National Gallery; and that for them recourse must be had to a certain type of sarcophagus, specimens of which, as it happens, had been brought to England just before Keats wrote the poem. A still better instance of the same kind is Sir Sidney's suggestion that painting as well as sculpture played its part in giving Keats the enchanting vision of his Grecian Urn. Does not this very epithet 'enchanting'—the first and most natural that seems to offer itself about the poem, one which I took almost by accident and without thinking about it—itself suggest something in the poem which could not be got from that noblest and severest of all beautiful things, Greek sculpture?

So we find Sir Sidney claiming that the German and other critics who have written on the works of ancient art which may have influenced Keats have not covered all the ground; and that, to do so, we must look to painting as well, and in particular to two beautiful Claudes, 'The Sacrifice of Apollo' and 'The Enchanted Castle,' the first of which we know was exhibited in London in 1816, while the second may easily have been known to Keats through Woollett's engraving. The two pictures first unite to provide the material for the description of a sacrifice in the Epistle to Reynolds which the poet himself believed was a recollection of Titian. Then 'The Sacrifice,' as everyone will recognise in future now that Sir Sidney has pointed it out, provides the hint for the wonderful fourth stanza of the 'Grecian Urn,' and not merely for the sacrifice itself, the altar and the victim and the priest, but also for these lovely lines :

'What little town by river or seashore,  
Or mountain, built with peaceful citadel,  
Is emptied of this folk, this pious morn?'

And finally, the other Claude, 'The Enchanted Castle,' returns to give us the two famous lines which have more of romance in them than any other lines of Keats, perhaps more than any lines in all English poetry:

'Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam  
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.'

The whole of Sir Sidney's treatment of this subject deserves study as showing the way in which one poet fused materials, drawn from many sources of memory and touched afresh by imagination, into a new creation more real than any reality. People talk of a poet writing with his eye on the object. Wordsworth says somewhere that he could not do that; and still less could Keats. Even the French painter, Degas, who seems to some people to have loved ugliness as much as Keats loved beauty, could not paint with the object before him. In all these cases, as preeminently in Keats, the eye must industriously do its preliminary work; who can compare with Keats in the eye that has seen, the ear that has heard, the memory that has retained, every delightful thing in Nature or in Art of which his few years had given him the experience? But, when he is to use them, the mind and not the eye is master, and deals with them as it will. Unconsciously perhaps; for our imagination is even more unconscious of its elements than our will. It is likely enough that Keats never once thought of 'The Enchanted Castle' as he wrote the 'Ode to the Nightingale'; but it had sown its secret seed in him, and the 'magic casements' and 'perilous seas' were the fruit.

The subject of Keats's debt to works of art receives pictorial illustration here by the reproduction of several of those referred to, the two Claudes, a sarcophagus relief and three or four vases, the Townley, the Borghese, the Sosibios, and one of Piranesi's. The other illustrations include three portraits of Keats, portraits of Leigh Hunt and Haydon, and facsimiles of part of Keats's autograph of Isabella and of part of a letter of Haydon to Mrs Browning which includes a sketch of Keats. One other feature of the book deserves mention. It is provided

*Index*  
with an exceptionally complete Index which occupies forty pages. There is only one deficiency. The book lacks the one or two blank pages at the end which every book of this sort should have, in order that the studious reader may make notes of points of special interest to himself. No Index can be full enough to do this work for everybody. This is one of the things which publishers ought to remember but constantly forget.

Of actual novelty there is not and could not be a great deal. There are a few new facts, such as, for instance, that Keats left school in 1811 and not in 1810, and that he was entered at Guy's Hospital not in 1814 but in 1815; matters of little enough importance, both of them, but well to have got right instead of wrong. Of far greater interest are such discoveries as that the famous Sonnet, 'Bright Star, would I were steadfast as thou art,' was not written, as had been supposed, for Severn off the English coast as he and Keats started for Italy. It exists, in a slightly different form, given here, in a transcript made by Keats's friend, Charles Brown, and dated 1819; and Sir Sidney Colvin gives his reasons for thinking that it was written in the last days of February of that year, a few days after the engagement to Fanny Brawne. By this discovery it loses the pathetic interest which it owed to the belief that it had been Keats's unconscious farewell to poetry. But it gains another kind of interest. Those who love Keats have great difficulty in not actually disliking the unpleasantly named girl to whom he gave himself with such destructive violence of poorly reciprocated passion. But, after all, what Keats loved they cannot hate; and they must rejoice to know that, whatever injury Fanny Brawne's acceptance of his love may ultimately, through his weakness and her triviality of character, have done to his happiness and health and poetic powers, its first days produced not torment or jealousy or failure, but one of the most beautiful things that ever came from his genius. The changes he made when he wrote the poem out again for Severn are enough to show that his instinct for language was never finer than in his last months, so long as it was employed upon its proper business. The rhymes are the same in both versions;

the alterations do not affect either the structure or the general sense of the sonnet. But much of the magic of the final version is due to the verbal changes introduced into Severn's copy. The star 'in lone splendour hung aloft the night' is something that it was not when it was 'hung amid the night'; the softness and ease which is the note of the whole had been impeded by the inverted metrical stress of 'nature's devout sleepless Eremite' and is restored by the substitution of 'patient' for 'devout'; the 'moving' waters, which recall, and may unconsciously echo, Wordsworth's:

'Listen! the mighty Being is awake,  
And doth with his eternal motion make,  
A sound like thunder—everlastingly';

are, in Brown's transcript, perhaps by his mistake, the 'morning' waters, which loses all the suggestion of the tides for ever travelling round the earth on their errand of purification.

'Pillowed on my fair love's ripening breast'

was at first

'Cheek-pillow'd on my Love's white ripening breast';

and the final couplet was

'To hear, to feel her tender taken breath  
Half-passionless, and so swoon on to death.'

This last line was known to Lord Houghton and was given by him as a variant, from what source he does not state. The departure from it in the final version is not, as it seems to me, so certainly an improvement as the other changes. It is doubtful whether the sonnet gains by the new version which makes death not a sequence but an alternative,

'And so live ever—or else swoon to death,'

or by the omission of the word 'half-passionless,' which confirms the 'sweetness' of the 'unrest.' But the most unquestionable gain of all is one curiously enough not mentioned by Sir Sidney Colvin. It is in the eleventh line, which originally ran:

'To touch, for ever, its warm sink and swell.'

Keats must have felt that the associations of the word 'sink' as a substantive were absolutely fatal, as in fact they are; and the line took the form we know:

'To feel for ever its soft fall and swell.'

This is probably the most interesting and important of the novelties in the book; though others, such as the discovery that the 'Ode to Psyche' was almost certainly written not last but first of the five Odes, also have their interest.

But the object of the new Life was not, I take it, to give novelties or discoveries to the public. That was impossible. There could not, in the nature of the case, be many things to say about Keats which were both new and true; and Sir Sidney does not belong to that school of writers, so fashionable a few years ago, who think that the way to write history or biography is on every occasion to turn the facts upside down, give us black for white, round for square, and generally to substitute epigrams and paradoxes for sense and truth. His object in returning to Keats was something much more modest than this. It was to gather together all that is known about Keats, the little which is new, the much which is old, the whole of the truth about his life and his character and his writings, and to present it to the public in final and authoritative shape. That he has done. It is to be hoped that the second edition, which it is understood is in preparation, will correct the misprints of the first, one at least of which is most unfortunate, especially as it also occurs in Mr de Selincourt's edition of the poems, and therefore, between these two high authorities, might have a chance of establishing itself in anthologies and elsewhere. It occurs in the fine sonnet, 'When I have fears that I may cease to be.' Both Mr de Selincourt and Sir Sidney—the latter perhaps transcribing the former—print in the fourth line:

'Hold like <sup>rich</sup> full garnerers the full-ripened grain.'

It should, of course, be 'rich garnerers'; 'full' is a mere misprint, without any authority.

Perhaps the poem for which Sir Sidney Colvin here does most is the too much neglected 'Endymion,' Keats's

one completed work on a large scale; a poem full of faults of taste and art, which Sir Sidney neither conceals nor spares, but full also of extraordinary beauties, perhaps even more peculiarly his own than those of later and more perfect poems. It is commonly thought to be at once tedious and trivial. The truth is that to those who are at all accustomed to read long poems, which always make such a demand on the faculty of continuous imaginative attention as is apt to lead to weariness, neither of these charges is more than partly and occasionally true.

‘Thee gentle Spenser fondly led  
But me he mostly sent to bed.’

Many people who have loved ‘The Faery Queen’ as much as Landor loved it little would admit that they also had gone to sleep over it. Very likely even Wordsworth did. But that does not mean that it is not a poem which most lovers of poetry find the very opposite of tedious when their faculty of poetic appreciation is really alive. So also with ‘Endymion,’ though no one of course would rank Keats’s poem with Spenser’s. It was written when he was too young to be equal to the difficult architectonics of a poem on so large a scale, and when his critical sense was too immature to save him from innumerable false notes in fancy and in language. But the conception of his story is a fine and high one; much of it, particularly the lyrics, is written in what can fairly be called a high and noble manner; no poem in the world contains more observation of natural beauty; and a good many parts of the story are effectively told, and can be read with interest and even with eagerness. As to the triviality or vulgarity, there are no doubt trivial passages born of Keats’s youth and suburbanism. But the poem as a whole is just the reverse; it is of a high seriousness and grave moral. It deals with the problem which filled his mind from the first, that of how to love beauty and live the life of the imagination without falling into any luxurious day-dreaming indifference to the sorrows and needs of the actual world around us.

The notion sometimes expressed—as not long ago by a critic who approaches Keats with ears too full of Shelley—that it was only at the end of Keats’s life, and notably in

the 'Fall of Hyperion,' that the 'miseries of the world were at last misery to him and not something to make poetry about,' is a complete and ignorant delusion, as well as a great injustice to Keats. Keats did not possess that burning passion for the cause of humanity and the triumph of right which is both a strength and a weakness to the poetry of Shelley. But how many men in a century do? To fancy that Keats, because he was not Shelley, was a luxurious egoist who regarded other men's unhappiness as just so much material for fine writing, is to fly in the face of all the facts. A single one is enough to refute the libel. It is in Keats's earliest volume, published when he was only twenty-one, that 'Sleep and Poetry' is to be found with its well-known lines:

'And can I ever bid these joys farewell?  
Yes, I must pass them for a nobler life,  
Where I may find the agonies, the strife  
Of human hearts.'

No one who has an ear can mistake this for the language of a man who makes fine phrases about what he does not feel, and it has plenty of confirmation elsewhere. The truth is that what is remarkable about Keats is not his caring about the sorrows of humanity so little and so late, but his caring about them so much and so early. His danger was, in fact, all the other way. Nothing shows more strikingly how essentially English, and therefore practical and utilitarian, he was than the half-regret for his life as that of 'a dreaming thing' expressed in the 'Fall of Hyperion,' and the half-desire that he had given it to something more practical—feelings rightly condemned by Sir Sidney Colvin as entirely unjust and morbid. The work Keats came into the world to do was that of a poet, not that of a reformer or a philanthropist; and he did a hundred times more service to humanity in his own way in his brief twenty-five years than he would have done in another way, though he had reached the Psalmist's utmost fourscore.

None of the other poems, not even 'Hyperion,' needs so much interpretation as 'Endymion'; and Sir Sidney Colvin says much less about them. On the problem of why Keats abandoned 'Hyperion,' and what it was to have been if it had been completed, he has an interesting

suggestion to make. It has often been said that Keats had left himself nothing to do in the rest of the poem. The elder gods are already defeated, and Hyperion could not long stand alone. How could the struggle have been prolonged or made interesting? Again, as Sir Sidney says, Keats had given so much majesty to his fallen gods that it is hard to see how he could have found anything higher for their successors. This, however, is a very dangerous argument. All the great poets—Milton, Shakespeare, Dante—seem always to be threatening us with an inevitable anti-climax, and then astonishing us with a new display of power. Who does not feel at the beginning of the 'Paradiso' that it cannot possibly get any higher, and yet, at the end, that there has been a peak behind every peak, and that the glory of light with which it opens is utterly outshone by the shining splendour of its close?

Keats's mind was not easily exhausted; 'the prolific activity of his imagination was always,' as Mr Bridges has said, 'providing him with fresh material to work on,' so that 'in this respect he is above all poets an example of what is meant by inspiration; the mood which all artists require, covet, and find most rare was the common mood with him.' This is the truth, and is one of the reasons why 'Endymion,' in spite of its incoherence, can give so much pleasure. If it is always languishing for lack of constructive power, it is always reviving by the abundance and force of the spring of poetry which for ever bubbled up in Keats. And yet it is Mr Bridges who wrote more than twenty years ago, and has since repeated, the strange assertion that Keats gave up 'Hyperion' because he could not continue it, because the new gods are as melancholy as those whom they have displaced, and who have the excuse of dethronement; because, in fact, the story 'was strangling itself.' But anybody who looks carefully at the fragment of the third book will see that this at least is not the case. There are only 135 lines of it; but in them Apollo is already, as he himself says, 'deified' and 'become immortal.' The tears of line 42 and the bewildered sadness of his address to Mnemosyne pass away as if he had drunk 'some blithe wine'; his eyes are 'enkindled'; a change comes over him like that of one who 'dies into

life'; his limbs become 'celestial'; and that is the last word of all. Clearly the final note of the poem is one of birth and joy, not of death and defeat.

But what did Keats mean to make of his new-born god? It seems, as Sir Sidney Colvin says, that nothing could have very long delayed the defeat or abdication of Hyperion; and no battle between old gods and new, supposed by Keats's friends to have been the intended action of the poem, could in the state of things described have had much reality. Sir Sidney, therefore, makes the suggestion that the poet meant to represent the new-enthroned Apollo not as a conqueror but as a prophet, and to put into his mouth a great vision of the world's future. This is, of course, only a guess, though an interesting one. Two or three things may be said about it. One, that, as Sir Sidney Colvin points out, Apollo in his speech to Mnemosyne says that it is 'knowledge enormous' that makes a God of him. And in this connexion he might have added that the things which pour into Apollo's brain at that moment—

'Names, deeds, gray legends, dire events, rebellions,  
Majesties, sovran voices, agonies,  
Creations and destroyings'—

are just the things for a great speech of divine prophecy. Another point is this. 'Hyperion' was of course written under the strongest Miltonic influence. It was born in admiration of Milton, lived in imitation of him, died, as the poet himself says, in fear of him. What more likely than that Keats, having before him Milton's method of describing the history of the world by putting it as a prophecy into the mouth of an angel, should make Apollo, who was after all the god of prophecy, play the same part in his poem? Mr de Selincourt, in his edition of the poems, had already anticipated Sir Sidney Colvin in rejecting Woodhouse's assertion that a great battle was to be the chief action of the poem. His reasons and Sir Sidney's seem conclusive. Keats may have once intended to deal with the subject as Woodhouse describes, but the part already written shows that he had changed his mind. Mr de Selincourt thinks the work was not to have been a very long one, that Hyperion would have yielded at the sight of Apollo's supreme beauty, and that

the poem would have closed with a 'description of the new age inaugurated by the triumph of the Olympians, and in particular of Apollo, the god of light and song.' It would seem that this conjecture is not inconsistent with Sir Sidney's, which rather expands it. The 'description of the new age' as conceived by Mr de Selincourt might not unnaturally have led to Sir Sidney's 'prophecy.' There is, however, one serious difficulty which neither critic faces. If the poem were to be what they suggest how could it be called 'Hyperion'? His part in the unwritten conclusion would be even less dominant than it is in the existing two books of the poem. The only way out of this seems to be that the name is a survival from the scheme of the action as first conceived by Keats.

It may be safely said that every lover of Keats's poems will find both pleasure and profit in going through them again under Sir Sidney Colvin's guidance. He has light to throw on most of them. Nothing, for instance, could possibly be better—in spite of his own apology—than his analysis of the way in which the genius of Keats is to be seen at work in the so often underrated 'Isabella.' Unlike the majority of critics, he considers this the finest of the three Tales. The truth, perhaps, is that it has more faults of execution than either the 'Eve of St Agnes' or 'Lamia,' but that it is more of a coherent whole, more of a consistent story than either. It is one action told in one mood; everything in it contributes to the action or heightens the mood. This is not the case in 'St Agnes'; it is the very opposite of the case in 'Lamia.' Nobody cares about Madeline so much as we all do about Isabella; she and her story are so much more shadowy. There is no lovelier poem in English, but is anybody quite sure at the end what exactly has happened, what Porphyro either intends to do or does, what the Beadsman has to do with the story, what is the meaning or purpose of the banquet, why the poem ends with the miserable deaths of Angela and the Beadsman, as if the main action were meant to be unhappy and they guilty of the unhappiness? One cannot raise such questions without a sense of profanity; but, even though one does not ask them, one is vaguely conscious that they are there to be asked.

In 'Lamia' this uneasiness is not latent at all, it is

forced upon us. And in this case Sir Sidney Colvin makes himself its very frank spokesman. 'The one fundamental flaw in "Lamia" concerns its moral. The word is crude; what I mean is the bewilderment in which it leaves us as to the effect intended to be made on our imaginative sympathies.' Lamia is a witch, a serpent-woman; and from the first we feel that no good can come of Lycius's love for her. Yet the sage, Apollonius, who detects her cheat, who would deliver her pupil from her, and who finally destroys both him and her in doing so, is throughout unsympathetically represented. What did Keats mean us to think, what, even more, did he mean us to feel, when we finish reading the poem? The answer is that nobody knows; and it is an answer fatal to the highest claims made for 'Lamia.' We may not be able to explain Hamlet; but Shakespeare never leaves us in a moment's doubt whether we are to sympathise with him or not.

But this is not the place to follow Sir Sidney Colvin in his journey along the familiar road through the poems. That pleasure must be left to readers of his book, who will find that, if the road is familiar, he has new things to show them on it, or things worth hearing to say about the old. The Odes, for instance, are among the most universally known of all English poems; but they will be known better by those who read what is here said about them. One, and one only, of the remarks made may be quoted here for the sake of carrying it a little further than Sir Sidney does. He says of the 'Ode to Maia' that it is 'in a more truly Greek manner than anything else Keats wrote, not even excepting the "Ode to Autumnn."' This is true, and true not only because of the 'mint-mark of absolute economy' of which Sir Sidney speaks. It is not only that there is not a superfluous word in the 'Ode to Autumnn,' but that, except the unpleasant rhyme of 'Maia' and 'Baiae,' there is not a word which is not the perfect word. There is no other poem by Keats—not even the sonnet on Chapman's Homer, where the word 'expanse' can hardly claim to be inspired or final—of which either of these things can be said.

But I venture to think that there is even more than this. Keats was an essentially romantic poet from the first. Even Milton could not prevent his bringing

*Keats the  
romantic  
poet*

romanticisms into 'Hyperion.' And yet it is also true that he does often remind us of Shelley's answer to the question about him: 'because he was a Greek.' Wordsworth's tribute to the 'Hymn to Pan' is cool and exasperatingly inadequate, but it points to the fact. That Hymn is much more than 'a pretty piece of Paganism'; but it is that. And none of our great poets, in dealing with the religion of nature, has struck the Greek note nearly so closely as Keats. Mr C. F. Keary, who died a few months ago, had something of the same felicity, but no one will claim for him that he was more than a minor poet. To Keats, then, before all men, we must go for this. And nowhere else shall we find it in such consummate perfection as in this wonderful fragment. But the point I wished to suggest was this. Is not this unfinished Ode not only the most Greek thing, not only the most perfect thing, Keats ever wrote, but also, in a very real way, his most central piece, the thing which most combines his marvellous gifts? It is steeped in Romance, in the antiquity, mystery, distance, which are the essence of Romance. But it is quite free from the habitual faults of Romance—from its luxury, its superfluity, its love of ornament for ornament's sake, its sacrifice of the main action to scenery or circumstance, or even to irrelevant digression. All these faults are common in most of Keats's poems. Their absence here is due to a unique combination of his inborn instinct for Romance with a Greek sense of restraint, of the favourite Greek virtue of 'temperance,' with something of a Greek consciousness of the half being more than the whole, of few words in these things saying more than many. One is glad that it was left unfinished—it might so easily have been spoilt; and nothing could have given it a higher place among Keats's work than, at least in my judgment, it already has.

Into Sir Sidney's account of the life, as distinct from the works, of Keats, I have here scarcely attempted to go. His book contains a most interesting picture of Keats and his family and friends; of the latter, in particular, the biographer turns aside from time to time to draw for us brilliant little portraits, such as those of Lamb and Hazlitt, Hunt and Haydon. But considerations of space imposed a choice upon me, and it was

easily made. Keats is not one of those poets, the events of whose lives can challenge interest with their works. No one was ever more wholly a poet; the best record of his life and character is to be found in his poetry. Not that there is anything to conceal—quite the reverse. In fact, the more that is known about him, the more does it become clear that the man was of a stronger, manlier, more active and generous nature than a first reading of his poems might lead one to suppose. Sir Sidney Colvin makes one more effort to slay the long-lived legend, born of Byron and Shelley, that Keats was a timid, effeminate creature, all genius perhaps, but no courage or strength, who lived in a coterie of mutually admiring cockneys, and died in terror of the 'Quarterly Review.' Nothing could be further from the truth, as every one knows who has ever looked at the poet's delightful letters, which show a man as full of courage, generosity, kindness, and the sense of duty as of the love of poetry and the modest consciousness of genius. Their interest lies in that revelation of his mind and character much more than in anything which they record of what he privately did or suffered, until one comes to the misery of his passion and the tragedy of his illness and death. After all, his one great achievement was the writing of his poems; and the best offering we can make to his memory is to read them and read them again and again. He is, of all our English poets, the one who most unfailingly, most invariably, converts everything he touches into poetry; not always into good poetry, but never into anything else. Almost all our other poets might conceivably have been men of some other profession. No one can fancy Keats anything but a poet, a poet by birth and nature, by choice, by training, and finally by consummate achievement.

JOHN BAILEY.

Art. 10.—SHALL ENGLAND FINANCE GERMANY AFTER  
THE WAR? ✓

A SHORT time ago the writer was present when an English statesman of many years' experience asked a Russian, who had spent his life in Government finance, —'What is your opinion of the success of German plans for the economic exploitation of Russia?' The answer came very quickly and briefly: 'That depends wholly on whether or no Great Britain decides to finance Germany in accomplishing her objectives in Russia.' It is proposed in this paper to examine the grounds on which this answer is based, to show that it is strictly accurate, and to enquire into what should be the action of Great Britain upon this vital subject.

The crux of the whole matter lies in the banking customs which obtain in England. Prior to the War, London was the money centre of the world. She was the one great reservoir of accumulated capital upon which all nations might draw upon certain conditions concerned only with security and return. Thus it has been that English banking has been primarily international banking, and secondarily, by a long distance, industrial and commercial. Gradually, the local banks, with their study of local needs, have become absorbed in the London Joint Stock Banks with their innumerable branches. These large consolidations have drained the provinces of money, and have thereupon become the primary factors in carrying on the international banking of the world. If Germany purchased wheat in Australia, or cotton in America, or jute in India, or any nation purchased anything anywhere in the world, the commercial transaction was, almost without exception, financed by bills on London. London became the clearing-house of the world.

These vast financial transactions have been secured on bills accepted by approved banking institutions. The one relevant question is as to the liability of the acceptor and the rate of interest to be paid. No question as to the origin of the bill or the nature of the merchandise covered is the subject of enquiry. The bills then pass from bank to bank as freely as Government currency or Government securities. Prior to the War,

therefore, it was only necessary to possess such bills in order to secure any sum required. If money was tight, the rate of interest rose and thereby attracted to London the additional credits. Beneath the surface, London was always in possession of a great credit, able, by raising the rate, to call in her large outstanding balance.

Under such a system of international banking, any nation could, by a system of banking acceptance of drafts, negotiate in London bills to a colossal amount, always provided the total volume was within the apparent credit resources of the accepting banks and the commercial activities of the nation concerned. Large sums were loaned to America from time to time, through the medium of such finance bills, to move cotton and for other purposes; but the greatest use of this international reservoir of banking credit was made by Germany through her great banks, such as the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdner Bank.

Germany has, indeed, made a close technical study of the possible functions which a bank could perform in the aid of manufacture and commerce. Her banks were equipped not only with machinery for international banking, but with the most carefully organised departments for dealing with various branches of trade. They went further even than the study of these great industrial problems with a view to financing their needs; they took a direct and in some cases controlling interest by purchase and ownership of shares. For example, in the chemical trade a German bank owned a large portion, if not a majority, of the shares in one of the greatest of the dye-stuff companies, that at Elberfeld, known as the 'Farbenfabriken vormals Friedrich Beyer & Co.' A corps of experts trained from the business point of view, whose duty it was to study each industry and collect all the possible data thereon, was established in these banks. Therefore, if a manufacturer came, let us say, to the Deutsche Bank, and presented his plans for an industrial undertaking, he was at once put into communication with experts in his own line of business; and all the resources of knowledge and experience, including the reports of the Germans in British Consular pay, were placed at his disposal. If the bank, knowing the entire subject, decided to support him, it might first invest in

his corporation; in any event, it would give him a large line of credit. Indeed, it has been calculated that 90 per cent. of German industry before the War was done on credit and on a basis of only 10 per cent. capital. Far the greater part of the money came directly from London, and quite a fair portion from Paris. Credit was given the manufacturer by authorising those who sold to him to draw bills against his purchases in foreign countries or otherwise; and these bills, accepted by the Deutsche Bank, or other finance bills created in their stead, were then available for discount in London under the system above explained.

In order to elucidate fully the working of this plan, it is necessary to describe the methods adopted in Russia by the German commercial men, assisted by their banks. Russian credits are very long; the shortest period during which it is reasonably possible to secure an agreement to pay is one of nine months. At the end of that time, an extension of credit is probably necessary for an additional period of from three to nine months. It is obvious that the English merchant cannot give such long credits out of his own capital; and it is equally clear to any one who knows English banking methods that aid from English banks in giving such credit is quite out of the question. Consequently, the German merchant got the business. He arranged with the Russian bankers to guarantee the ultimate credit, and, being thus armed with the necessary credentials, was able to obtain a discount from his German bank as against his sales. Then the German bank through the medium of accepted bills, promptly obtained the necessary money in London, renewing so long as was necessary. Thus indirectly the English bank loaned to Germany the money to enable the German trader to destroy the business of the English, whom it refused to finance in like manner. The handling of credits in South America was similar; and in China, the German merchants, assisted by their banks, were rapidly overhauling the older established English houses when the War came on.

We have no intention of implying that the German banking system is in itself perfect or superior to the English. It is more than questionable whether a banking

concern should both finance a business and become a stockholder in it. The point to seize, however, is that this system, which has been built up with great care, is organised so that it can secure British banking credit on cheap terms, and then with its aid can advance the industrial and commercial interests of Germany. It is admirably adapted to achieve this end; and, so long as British banking credits are open to these uses, the German banking system will operate to build up successful competition with English trade. It is, of course, quite another question what would happen in these great German banks, with their immense investments in industrial enterprise, if the reservoir of banking credit in London and in Paris were closed to them.

The system of banking in the United States, now unified and expanded by the new Federal Act which took effect at about the beginning of the War, is for the most part a system of industrial and commercial banking very similar to the German, but without the feature of investment by the banks in industry. It is usually arranged that the borrowers should at least once a year clear up their banking loans. In the opinion of the American banker, it is not the function of the bank to supply fixed capital; but he is always prepared to finance against quick assets which constantly liquidate themselves. To use an instructive illustration—when the Southern cotton mills were formed, it was customary to subscribe the capital to be put into the plant and buildings, while the money ordinarily known as ‘working capital,’ invested in raw cotton, materials, etc., was financed by banking loans. Such loans were made on unsecured overdrafts. Thus a concern with a capital of, say, a million dollars invested in plant and machinery could borrow whatever amount was needed for raw materials, operation, etc. These Southern cotton-mills have been almost universally successful, and have transformed the Southern towns in which they are situated. In many cases they have now accumulated immense capital and have expanded far beyond their modest beginnings.

Some of the large banks in the United States, like the First National of Chicago, make, as do the German banks,

the most careful study of trade conditions. In the Eastern States a bank will become identified with one line of trade, and will probably know more about it than any single manufacturer in that line. The general idea of the whole purpose and duty of a bank is that, having made due allowance for its functions as trustee of deposited money, it should build up the community and expand its financial prosperity. Therefore in the States it is never an irrelevant question to ask, 'What is the purpose for which this money will be used?' Practically every loan undergoes this primary interrogation; and rate of interest and security are often subordinated to the very important question whether the loan is a proper one to make, regard being had, first, to local and, secondly, to national considerations.

We repeat, in this connexion, that we are not arguing that the American banking system is in itself better than the English. The point is that London was before the War, and probably will again be after it, the international money centre of the world. A country like the United States, which is very fully engaged in internal development, will necessarily think first of that development and care little about what profit might be made in some country across the sea. Thus the banking system of the States has been carefully adjusted to fulfil its natural function of supporting and expanding American manufacturing and commercial interests, while in England the banking system has gradually built up an impersonal and cosmopolitan machinery which supplies money to an applicant of any nationality who brings himself within its operations.

Coordinated with the growth of the London Joint Stock Banks and of the system of international banking outlined above, there has developed a strong tendency towards ignoring the needs of British trade and commerce, especially if the manufacturer or trader does not possess commanding capital and a great position. In the States, if a manufacturer has, let us say, his plant clear of encumbrances, he can readily borrow on his own signature, by way of unsecured draft, a great part, if not all, of the money he needs as working capital, including the purchase of raw materials. It is, of course, well for him to supply a certain proportion of this working

capital himself, so that he may be free to encounter and overcome any crises. If he is a manufacturer of average size, having, say, a capital of 100,000*l.* or 150,000*l.*, it is quite clear that he would have no such an opportunity in England. He could, of course, arrange with his own bank for an overdraft, but security would probably be demanded; and in any case the volume of credit granted is limited. What his bank wants to do is to lend on security. His bank is, it is true, not wholly to blame, because the manager has not at his elbow an organised staff to judge of the particular business and to estimate its requirements and the extent to which credit could properly be granted. Therefore there has grown up in England, so far as manufacturing is concerned, the necessity of financing most of the business done by means of paid-in capital. The banks are only an occasional and incidental aid. If it be a question of giving credits in a foreign country, say Russia, where the credit, even when guaranteed by a Russian bank, must be carried for a year or eighteen months, it is manifestly impossible for an applicant to obtain what he wants.

To London, therefore, possessed as it was of the great capital accumulations, the world came before the War for banking credits. Hence was evolved a system which would best function in supplying the world with such credits. The capital of Great Britain far exceeded the needs of her manufacturers and traders; and the surplus moved to London wherewith to supply the world. Slowly but surely, the private and local banks were absorbed into the London Joint Stock Banks; slowly but surely, the knowledge of local industrial needs, the instruments for furnishing these with banking credit, dried up; and in London the managers of the great banks, while losing their hold on the minutiae of business, gained in technical knowledge of purely international banking. Centralisation set in and triumphed; less and less did local and specialised business banking preserve the machinery that could safely and efficiently accomplish its ends.

From the banking point of view, apart from that of the community, such a system was highly satisfactory. It combined the finest security with the minimum of managerial effort; it enabled the vast accumulated

capital of Great Britain to find safe and profitable occupation. Moreover, it might be argued with force that there remained sufficient capital for legitimate industrial and commercial expansion—for instance, in giving continuous assistance to the agricultural community—without the employment of the banking credits used in international finance. If the manufacturer wished to enlarge his business or the trader to give long-time credits, he was bidden to increase his capital. It is indubitably true that this was his only course if he proposed to expand.

Such, then, was the banking system of Great Britain at the outbreak of War. Undisputed mistress of world-finance, arbiter of international banking credits, she ruled her kingdom with perfect fairness and equality of favour. An applicant who came to her doors, with the 'open sesame' of approved accepted bills, never went empty-handed away. What was done with the money thus obtained English banking neither knew nor asked. It might build the Bagdad railroad, or give length of credit to Russian purchases from Germany, or supplant British trade in South America and China; it was all one to English banking. Money was impersonal; the object to which its use was devoted was indifferent; the ultimate effect and reaction of such use was of no concern to the banker.

That the banking systems of nations like Germany and the United States were quite different, English bankers knew well; but they knew also that these countries lacked capital for home development, and hence their banking systems fulfilled different functions. This was quite true. It is a reason why the rate of German and American industrial expansion so far outstripped British in the twenty years preceding the War. If blood be 'the price of Admiralty,' then similarly has British commerce paid the cost of the British system of banking. It is debateable whether the profit equalled the loss; probably, even before the War, some modification might wisely have been made in the direction of supporting the British trader rather than his German rival. Be this as it may, the problem presented at the conclusion of the War will be far more vital, and it is the object of this paper to attempt its clarification.

Certain economic conditions peculiar to Great Britain may perhaps be regarded as affording a psychological explanation of the pre-war condition of English banking. England has been primarily a maritime country. Her ships had covered the globe and brought to this island great wealth and power. With the development of this wealth her men of commerce have used their own capital in their business. When they turned to manufacture what the world asked should be carried in British ships, each manufacturer, a strong individualist, used his own capital. Side by side with this development, the banking of England took on an international aspect in order to minister to the needs of this growing maritime commerce. When War came in 1914, we had, therefore, the one great international banking centre in London, the carrying trade of the world, and an individualistic manufacturing class operating on its own capital.

This fundamental economic force of sea-power educated the banker in all that appertains to international finance. His thoughts and convictions have this international scope and vision; they are of another order from the postulates and beliefs of the American banker, who sees the world from the point of view of the manufacturer and producer. The Englishman has built up an outlook of his own on financial life; London is its heart, international trade its very blood, bills of exchange its veins. He has developed a highly organised instinct; and that is just the point. Fabre, the great naturalist, tells us that instinct is to be compared to a narrow and intense beam of light, along which the creature moves with unerring precision, so long as it does not slip into the deep blackness on either side; while intellect is a diffused, universal radiance by which mankind may choose the path. It is therefore only natural that the English banker is unable to see that after-war problems of industrial finance are not to be solved by reliance on his international outlook and instinct. Capital will be scanty; production must be encouraged; internationalised banking will be England's enemy as surely as is international Bolshevism.

In 1916 a committee of eminent bankers was appointed 'to consider the best means of meeting the

needs of British firms after the War as regards financial facilities for trade,' etc. They reported as follows: 'The British banks afford, we believe, liberal accommodation to the home producer. British bankers are not shy in making advances on the strength of their customers' known ability and integrity.' This may be the conclusion of the banking world, but it is not that of the industrial community. The following questions when answered will determine: What, prior to the War, was the ratio of unsecured overdrafts on the balance sheets of the Joint Stock banks to those on the books of the American National Banks? One may doubt if it was 5 per cent. What percentage of the excess of accounts receivable and goods manufactured and unmanufactured over accounts payable will British banks loan to any reputable customer on unsecured overdraft? Will it be from 80 per cent. to 100 per cent. as with American banks? Finally, can the manufacturer at all times be just as certain of absolutely unsecured credits to this amount, as the money broker of discounting his approved accepted bill?

The committee reported in favour of the establishment of a Trade Bank, which has since been created. This should prove an eminently useful institution, but, inevitably, it will not even touch the points pressing for solution. The name-paper of one single American Department Store would absorb its entire issued capital. Obviously, the great *desideratum* is to make readily available as bankable credit the accounts receivable, raw materials, and goods manufactured or in process of manufacture; all of which items are grouped together in the States under the title of 'quick assets.' No single Trade Bank can accomplish this. It cannot possibly have the necessary knowledge of the applicant's position, as can the banker with whom he has dealt for years. There is no time nor opportunity for examination, nor should the manufacturer or trader be diverted from his business by considerations of this nature. Even if the Trade Bank made such advances, what would be the expense? If stockholders' money be lent, that will be costly; if funds be borrowed from another bank, the cost of the Trade Bank mediation must be added.

The function of the Trade Bank, as constituted, must

be to finance worthy promotions, whether of new companies or of new projects by old companies. To the extent that the bank attempts to make liquid the 'quick assets' of traders and manufacturers, the method is slow, cumbersome, and expensive; and the magnitude of the task is wholly beyond the capacity of such a bank. Only when 'quick assets' become immediately, readily, and cheaply transferable into bankable credit will the problem of financing British industrial production be solved. Only the great British banks of deposit can effect this object, and only directly on behalf of their own customers. But this must be accomplished at the cost of financing German accepted bills of exchange.

When my Russian friend stated that German success in exploiting Russia depended on British capital, he had in mind the fact that Germany to-day is economically as bare as the palm of one's hand. Everything exportable has been eaten up, shot away, worn out. Germany's exports are and must be manufactured products; and she has neither cotton nor wool nor copper. Nor has she, as any financier will admit, the possibility of payment in gold. She must have great credits even to begin to supply her own internal needs; without external aid, it would be quite hopeless to think of giving long credits to Russia, impoverished as Russia is. Germany will get little if any credit from America, firstly, because America has little machinery for granting large international credits; secondly, because she will need the money herself, and has never been in the habit of lending anything she can use herself; thirdly, because she will never lend money to any one who will use it against her, and it is her habit to examine into the ultimate effect of a grant of credit. Germany, therefore, must come to London. Come she will, and with her portfolio full of bills drawn and accepted to tickle the niceties of the English banking palate. What is the situation which will then exist and the reception she should receive?

There will be a great diminution in available banking credit after the War. We cannot develop the argument at length; it depends solely on the proposition that there has been a profound and widespread destruction of all forms of saved-up property, that is, of capital; that there is in the world to-day less food, less clothing, less coal,

less steel, less of everything, than in 1914. And it is quite irrefutable that no issues of currency, no inflation of credits, increase capital.

Again, Germany's opportunity to make large profits will be immense. Given the raw wool and cotton, she can sell clothing to Russia at profits many times larger than her *ante-bellum* return, provided she could obtain from London requisite credits to purchase the cotton, operate her mills, and give the necessary credits to Russian merchants. Equipped as she is, Germany can, in the international money market, pay the highest price for credit. Once obtained, she will use it most profitably; and the security will be adequate and certain.

No other nation in the world will be so well prepared as she to compete in London for banking credits; none will have a banking system so perfectly adjusted to furnish bankable accepted bills; none will have such thoroughly digested information available respecting trading opportunities and pitfalls; none will have a body of workmen so ready to work long hours and to produce so much and so cheaply. In the chaotic and disorganised condition of international trade, Germany will be best prepared to choose aright the path to safety and profit. If British international finance after the War continues to regard banking credit as a huge reservoir, the flow of which may be properly directed to whatever quarter will pay highest, then Germany, whose system is unique in the world, will get most of the money. There will be little left for British trade, which has to-day no organised banking aid whatever, and will not be able to pay, under the conditions of the future, a competitive price. Germany will therefore absorb, first for her own needs, secondly to enable her to finance Russian trade, and thirdly to control the commerce of China and South America, the greater part of the available capital of England. British trade will be drained of its life-blood. The days when, as it might be said, there was enough capital to go round, will then be long past; and an energetic Germany with the banking power of the British Empire at her service, with enhanced profits and cheaper labour, will accelerate the downfall of British commerce. Whatever the glory and profit which her proud position as the world's financial centre has in

the past brought to England, the price in the future may be too high to pay. In the last analysis, it is production which creates capital; and with the loss of industry will disappear the capital that constitutes banking credits.

One might, indeed, concede almost everything till this last point, and then protest. One might agree that the free untrammelled international money market of London before the War was a great national good and glory; one might acquiesce in the wisdom of granting to Germany, under former conditions, credits not given under existing machinery to British merchants; one might prefer free trade in money, insist on British trade being conducted only on its own capital, and answer all objectors by the consideration that to be the financial centre of the world brought its rewards as well as its penalties. But, after the War, British banking, with grossly insufficient capital to supply every need, must lie under the despotic necessity of choice whether the British manufacturer or the German is to go to the wall, whether Russia is to be the economic satellite of Germany or the field for British commercial energy, whether, in short, it is to be Germany or Britain which shall during the next fifty years enjoy commercial supremacy in Europe. Surely, this nation must pause before it permits a system of banking, however hallowed by custom, to determine such a question to the gradual extinction of England's greatness.

The question is simple. Shall the banking world in any form or under any pretence lend English capital to Germany, when English trade must depend for its very life upon the money so lent? The answer is equally simple: the existing banking system of loans secured by accepted bills must be modified to reach a solution. There is only one alternative: the decline and fall of the British Empire.

## Art. 11.—ISLAM AND THE WAR. ✓

THE end of the war still seems relatively so far off and the manner of its ending so obscure that it might be rash to speculate upon any of its ultimate and permanent results. But to the conduct of the war itself and of the peace negotiations, whenever that stage shall be reached, it is essential that we should take stock from time to time of its effects upon the great world forces directly or indirectly drawn within its fiery orbit.

One of the greatest of these is Islam, for it is a living religious force which has still preserved some of its original volcanic energy, and still unites upon the common ground of a stern and simple faith many different peoples, sprung from many different stocks, and speaking many different tongues, spread over a large part of the earth's surface, and numbering altogether, on the most moderate estimate, about 150 millions, or one-tenth of the world's population. In Europe itself the Mahomedans not only retain their foothold in Constantinople and the narrow strip of Thrace which was left to Turkey after the Balkan wars of 1912-13, but are still to be found in scattered groups where the receding tide of Turkish conquest left them under alien rule, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Albania, Serbia, Greece, Rumania and Bulgaria, as well as in the Crimea and the Caucasus, and even far up the valley of the Volga in what was until recently the great Russian Empire. In Asia they preponderate all over Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Arabia, Persia and Afghanistan and Central Asia; they form more than a fifth of the total population of our Indian Empire; they penetrate right into Eastern and South-Eastern China, and they reach across the seas into the Dutch East India islands and the Philippines. In Africa the people of Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, Algeria and Morocco are almost entirely Mahomedan, as are also the tribes of the Sudan and the Sahara and Northern Nigeria; and within the last half century Islam has made many millions of converts among the more primitive pagan populations of Central Africa.

To the vast majority of Mahomedans all over the world their religion is still vital, though, except in Central Africa, it has lost much of its old missionary fervour and fierceness. The ancient feud which arose shortly after

Mahomed's death over the succession to the Khalifate or Vicegerency of the Prophet still subsists between Sunni and Shia Mahomedans. There are a few other sects of much later growth, such as the Wahabis or 'Puritans' of Southern Arabia, and the Senussis of Northern Africa and the Babis of Persia, but they are numerically unimportant and have little influence outside their own borders. The claims of the Ottoman Sovereign to the spiritual headship of Islam since a descendant of the Abbaside Khalifs of Baghdad, who had found refuge in Cairo, transferred his shadowy rights to the Turkish Conqueror of Egypt, Selim I, about 400 years ago, have remained a more or less open question, upon which Mahomedan Doctors of the Law differed and still differ. Neither the Sultan of Morocco nor the Ameer of Western Africa, nor the Ameer of Afghanistan, nor the Khans of Central Asia, nor the Moghul Emperors of Hindustan, nor of course the Shah of Persia, who is a Shia, ever formally recognised the overlordship, either spiritual or temporal, of Constantinople. Constantinople wisely refrained from seeking to extract any such recognition from them; and even the late Sultan Abdul Hamid, when he started a Pan-Islamic movement in the hope of recovering as a spiritual ruler some of the ground he had lost as a temporal sovereign, confined his activities mainly to that part of the Mahomedan world which had passed into subjection to the Christian powers of Europe.

The strength of Islam lies in the essential simplicity of its creed; Allah, the one God; Mahomed, the one Prophet of God; the Koran, the one revelation of God's word; and, in theory at least, the Mahomedans the one people chosen of God to inherit the earth, for the world itself is divided into two parts only, the *Dar-ul-Islam*, or House of Islam, i.e. those lands which already belong to Islam, and the *Dar-ul-Harb*, the House of War, i.e. those lands which are still held by the infidel, but which will ultimately pass unto Islam by right of Holy War. These are the foundations upon which the unity of Islam has rested for more than thirteen centuries, rarely and only superficially shaken by the ebb and flow of conquest and defeat, or by political feuds, or by racial jealousies, or by sectarian differences.

Yet, far from inheriting the earth, the Mahomedans

have seen the *Dar-ul-Islam* shrinking steadily for several centuries past, and the *Dar-ul-Harb* encroaching upon them in almost every direction, especially during the last hundred years. The Turks, who once threatened Vienna, had been driven back almost to the walls of Constantinople. The Crimea and the Caucasus, and then Transcaspia and the whole of Central Asia, had passed under Russian rule, whilst with the transfer of the government of India to the British Crown in 1858, the last vestige of the Moghul Empire disappeared out of a sub-continent which contained a larger number of Mahomedans than any other country in the world. In Egypt and the Sudan, in Tripoli and Tunis, in Algeria and the Sahara, in Zanzibar on the Indian Ocean and in Morocco on the Atlantic, and even on the upper waters of the Niger, all independent power had passed out of the hands of the Mahomedans even when the trappings of titular sovereignty were left to the reigning dynasties. At the outbreak of the great war in 1914 Turkey was the one Mahomedan State left that could claim to rank as a great power, and Persia and Afghanistan were the only two others that still enjoyed a certain measure of independence. Turks, Persians and Afghans together numbered only some 20 or at the utmost 25 millions, while at least 80 or 90 million Mahomedans owned allegiance to Great Britain, some 20 millions to Russia, and a like number to France.

When Germany dragged Turkey into the great war as its ally, none could predict with absolute assurance what would be the attitude of Islam as a whole towards a conflict which threatened to rend the Mahomedan as well as the Christian world in twain, and to array Mahomedans against Mahomedans, even on the battlefield. Most Englishmen had been content to repeat light-heartedly the stock phrase that the British Empire was also the greatest Mahomedan Empire in the world, without realising that the phrase might in certain circumstances have a deep and ominous significance, which Germany with her usual thoroughness had been labouring for years past to bring home to us at the appointed hour. That hour had now struck.

In an article entitled 'Turkey in the Grip of Germany' I have already described in this Review (January 1915)

the policy, as deep laid as it was skilfully and patiently carried out, by which Germany, under William II's inspiration, had in the course of two decades established her military, political and economic hold over Turkey. He had built scarcely less on the spiritual influence of the Sultan as Khalif with the Mahomedan world outside Turkey. He had himself set the seal of his approval on Abdul Hamid's Pan-Islamic propaganda in the flamboyant speech he delivered as far back as 1898 in Damascus. That Abdul Hamid did succeed in making some impression upon the Mahomedan world is beyond doubt. It was admitted at the time that the great rising of fanatical tribesmen on the north-west frontier of India, which was only quelled with difficulty by the Tirah campaign of 1898, was mainly an echo of the Turkish victories of the preceding year in Thessaly—victories which the German Emperor applauded as the first-fruits of the reorganisation of the Turkish armies by his own officers. From that time onwards the Sultan's name came to be introduced more and more generally into the *Khutba* during the Friday prayers in the Mosques of India. The growing ascendancy of their Hindu rivals, as well as the gradual subjection of other Mahomedan states to European tutelage, induced many Indian Mahomedans to turn wistful eyes towards Constantinople as the one remaining bulwark of Islam; and the Turkish disasters during the first Balkan War aroused amongst them an amount of genuine distress and sympathy far in excess of any feeling they had manifested during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78.

In Persia, a general state of anarchy, checked only by Russian intervention in the north, and by our own command of the Persian Gulf in the south, had created an atmosphere eminently favourable to Turkish intrigue; and the 'young' Persians of Teheran seemed as ready to forget that they were Shias as the 'young' Turks of Constantinople to forget that they were Sunnis in their common detestation of the Anglo-Russian *rap-prochement*. In Afghanistan, as amongst the tribes of the Indian frontier, the fierce fanaticism of the *mullahs* needed very little encouragement from Turkish Pan-Islamism. In Egypt Abdul Hamid had been in close touch both with the so-called 'liberals' of the Nationalist

Party and with the Khedive, Abbas Hilmi, whose autocratic instincts resented the restraints placed by British tutelage on the revival of ancient methods of oppression; and after Abdul Hamid's fall the Committee of Union and Progress maintained even closer relations with the discontented elements on the Nile and in every Mahomedan country under alien rule. The part which Enver Pasha played in organising Arab resistance to the Italian occupation of Tripoli is well known, and he brought about for the first time an understanding between Constantinople and the widespread organisation of the Senussis of North Africa, to whose school of religious thought the Turks had hitherto been as abhorrent as any infidel power. Pan-Islamic agents were also occasionally discovered to be busy in Tunis and Algeria; and, though Abdul Hamid had been too astute to give prominence in Morocco to his spiritual claims as Khalif, which would only have aroused the jealousy of the Moroccan Sultan, he had sought to revive long-forgotten relations between Constantinople and Fez by means of friendly letters and complimentary missions, following clearly enough the lead given to him by the German Emperor, who during his sensational visit to Tangier at the time of the first Moroccan 'crisis' in 1905 constituted himself the champion of Mahomedan sovereignty and independence in Morocco in language as unequivocal as that in which he had, a few years earlier, proclaimed himself at Damascus the friend and defender of the Sultan and Khalif.

It was not, therefore, unnatural that Germany and Turkey should have reckoned on some response from the Mahomedan world beyond the pale of Turkish rule when the Sultan was induced to proclaim a Holy War against the infidel Powers of the Entente, and William II allowed the report to spread throughout the whispering galleries of the East that he himself had embraced Islam and assumed the title of Hajji Wilhelm Mahomed. From German writers themselves we know very well what Germany's expectations were. She had steadily supported the Pan-Islamic movement in the belief that it was bound to cause embarrassment to every European power that had to reckon with a large Mahomedan element in its colonies and dependencies, whilst she herself,

having practically no Mahomedan subjects to speak of, had nothing to fear from the explosion for which she was helping to lay the train. The least that she looked for was that in the event of a great war, in which Turkey was to side with her, neither England nor France would be able to move the white troops required to secure the maintenance of order amongst the Mahomedan populations of their respective possessions, and still less would venture to employ their Mahomedan regiments in the field, either against Turkey or against the allies of Turkey. Germany's hopes, however, went much further than this. How far they went can be gathered from the stories circulated by German wireless from Berlin during the early stages of the war—Mahomedan risings against the French in Tunis and Morocco, anti-British riots in Egypt, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the premier Mahomedan ruling prince of India, overthrown by his people on account of his loyalty to the British *raj*, mutinies and risings in the principal Mahomedan cities of India, Mahomedan sepoys refusing to sail for Europe and seizing the arsenals and barracks at Bombay, and many other fairy tales of the same type.

Why did none of these things happen? Why did Pan-Islamism prove a broken reed in the hands of the Berlin and Constantinople plotters? Why did the *Jehad*—the proclamation of the Holy War—fail even in Turkey to kindle any real religious fervour? Why did Mahomedan troops fight gallantly not only shoulder to shoulder with the British and the French against the Germans on the Western front, but against the Turks themselves in Egypt and Mesopotamia? Why did the great Mahomedan communities in India and in Egypt, in Tunis and Algeria, and even in the more remote regions of Central Asia, far from being stirred to rebellion against their alien rulers, give demonstrative proofs of their undiminished loyalty, and bear willingly their share in all the sacrifices required of them during this long and arduous struggle? How is it that the fundamental conception of the religious unity of Islam has proved a less potent force than the accident of political allegiance to one or other of the Christian Powers engaged in war with the one great Mahomedan Power that claimed spiritual overlordship in the

Mahomedan world? How is it, in fact, that Pan-Islamism, when put to the supreme test, has, so far, failed?

Amongst the more general causes of its failure must no doubt be reckoned the fatalism common to most Orientals, and especially characteristic of all Mahomedans, which leads them to accept all things—including alien rulership—as preordained. Nor had they any serious grievance against their alien rulers, who, as a rule, scrupulously respected their religious and domestic customs, and where, as in India, they formed only a minority of the population, effectively guaranteed their rights against the encroachments of other communities. So far as material prosperity is concerned they were unquestionably far better off under their alien rulers than their coreligionists under Mahomedan rulers. Least of all had the Mahomedan troops, who 'eat the salt' of alien rulers, any cause to be discontented with their lot. The Indian sepoy and the Algerian spahi—which are only different forms of the same word—had generally far more confidence in, and often far more personal devotion to, their Christian officers than to those of their own stock. Even in the Russian service Mahomedans were exceptionally well-treated, and sometimes rose to very high rank, much higher than they could attain to in the British or French services. The Mahomedan, moreover, has an innate respect for constituted authority; and, though at times he may 'see red' and break through the accustomed bonds of discipline, there was nothing at the first outbreak of war to tempt him to incur the tremendous risks of disloyalty. For, when the war began, it involved only two groups of European powers—infidels all in the eyes of the orthodox Mahomedan; and, though in India particularly our alliance with Russia was distasteful to him, there was nothing to attract him towards Germany. Many Indian sepoys, indeed, retained a vivid memory of the overbearing attitude of the Germans in China during the joint operations against the Boxers, and of their brutality towards the unfortunate Chinese people.

By the time Turkey came into the war German 'methods of frightfulness' had already acquired a sufficiently sinister notoriety to discredit any ally who took sides with Germany. Some thoughtful Mahomedans

with whom I have discussed the question admit that if the Sultan had joined Germany at the very outset and proclaimed the *Jehad* before the world had had time to realise what German domination meant, his appeal to the Mahomedan world might have been more effective. But in any case it would have remained an admittedly moot point amongst Mahomedans whether the proclamation of a *Jehad* can have any religious validity in a war waged by a Mahomedan power in alliance with non-Mahomedans. It certainly fell flat even in Turkey, where there have been few signs of anything resembling a real outburst of religious enthusiasm for the war; and amongst the Mahomedan subjects of the Entente Powers it has passed almost entirely unnoticed.

For the complete failure of Turkey to make any capital out of Pan-Islamism during the war there is, however, another and a deeper reason, namely, that Pan-Islamism itself had lost much of whatever vital force it possessed when Abdul Hamid disappeared and 'Young Turkey' came into power with the Constantinople Revolution of 1908. The Committee of Union and Progress began by borrowing for a short time the watchwords of the French Revolution, 'Liberty, equality and fraternity.' A new era was to open in which all creeds and communities and races were to enjoy equal rights, and a common sense of patriotism was to wipe out all the old lines of sectarian and racial cleavage. This ideal phase lasted but a very short time. It was succeeded by the policy of 'Ottomanisation,' which in one form or another has held the field ever since. That policy was and is essentially a policy of Turkish Nationalism. Liberty, equality and fraternity were not to be openly expunged from its vocabulary, but the subject races of Turkey were to get no benefit from them unless they showed themselves willing to be made into good Ottomans, i.e. to surrender their own national traditions and customs and languages, which had been guaranteed to them from the time of the first Turkish conquest, and become merged in a new Ottoman nationhood.

Such a policy could only claim to be Pan-Islamic in so far as it aimed at securing the supremacy of the Turkish element, which is almost exclusively Mahomedan. On the other hand, it estranged those Mahomedan

elements which are not Turkish, e.g. the Albanians and the Arabs, quite as much as the Christian elements. In fact, it was with the Albanians that the Committee of Union and Progress first got into serious trouble over the Turkish school question. Of more enduring importance was the resentment caused amongst the Arab population, which occupies so large a part of the Sultan's Asiatic Empire, viz. the whole of Syria and Mesopotamia as well as Arabia, the very provinces which bulk largest in the eyes of all devout Mahomedans, as they contain every one of the Holy Cities, Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, Kerbela, Nedjeff and Baghdad, that are the cherished objects of pilgrimage to both Sunnis and Shias. Arabic, too, is the sacred language of the Koran, and any attempt to displace it in favour of Turkish must be deeply wounding to every Orthodox Mahomedan. Turkish rule had always been hateful to the Arabs, and some of the more remote parts of Arabia had never been reduced into permanent subjection, or had generally been in a state of chronic insurrection.

Abdul Hamid had been astute enough to show favour to influential Arabs. Early in his reign he had given dire offence to the Turkish bureaucracy of Stambul by selecting a Tunisian Arab, Khair-ed-Din, to be his Grand Vizier. Arab troops formed part of his Prætorian Guard at Yeldiz Kiosk. Abul-Huda, who was the keeper of such conscience as he possessed; and his most intimate political advisers and confidential agents were Arabs. The annual caravan sent from Constantinople for the Mecca pilgrimage was loaded with his gifts; and he spared no efforts to win over—by fair methods or foul—the Sherif of Mecca, whose spiritual and temporal authority can boast one title denied to the Sultan, namely, that he is a Koreish and a fellow tribesman of the Prophet. Abdul Hamid, who was never much of a Turk at heart, and is believed, in fact, to have had very little Turkish blood in his veins, regarded the Arabs as the pivot of his Pan-Islamic policy—a policy which, it must be admitted, was, in some of its aspects, a by no means ignoble conception. 'There are no nationalities,' he once said, 'in Islam; and the Sultan as Khalif has a right to claim the services of the best Mahomedans wherever they can be found.'

The 'Young Turks' of the Committee of Union and Progress, on the contrary, took the line, in practice if not in theory, that Turkish nationalism must be supreme. They were ready enough to use Pan-Islamism whenever and wherever it could be made to further the purposes of Turkish nationalism, but it was only their second string. Religion indeed weighed very lightly on them; and they speedily alienated conservative Mahomedan feeling throughout the Turkish Empire by sending into the provinces 'Young Turkish' officials who, to prove how 'enlightened' they were, often gloried in publicly disregarding Mahomedan customs and flouting religious susceptibilities. All this had had its effect also upon the Mahomedan world outside Turkey, even before the war broke out; and, when the present Sultan unfurled the Banner of the Prophet and declared the *Jehad* against the Allies as infidels, though himself in subordinate alliance with two equally infidel powers, his appeal lacked the religious sanction which Abdul Hamid's name would have carried. For Mehmet V was known to be a mere puppet in the hands of the real rulers of Turkey, and the orthodoxy of these rulers was suspect.

There was, perhaps, one other name which might have carried sufficient weight to counteract the 'Young Turks' loss of spiritual credit with the Mahomedan world if its seal had been set upon the Constantinople *Jehad*. It was that of the Sherif of Mecca, invested with all the sacred prestige of the Holy City, towards which every Mosque is oriented and every Mahomedan turns in prayer. But, if Abdul Hamid had failed to capture him, the 'Young Turks' were not likely to be more successful. They brought every means of persuasion to bear upon him, but in vain. He not only refused to see any warrant for a Holy War in the circumstances which had induced Turkey to break, at the instance of one non-Mahomedan sovereign, with another who, though no doubt also a non-Mahomedan, ruled with justice and tolerance over millions of good Mahomedans, but he paid back the ruthless nationalism which the 'Young Turks' had substituted for Abdul Hamid's Pan-Islamism in its own kind by hoisting the flag of Arab national independence against Turkey. The valuable services which the King of the Hedjaz has rendered to us in the

field, and especially by shutting off the Turks and their allies from all access by land to the Red Sea, where they had hoped to establish fresh bases for their mines and submarines, have been, perhaps, less important than that which he rendered to us in refusing from the very first to endorse the Constantinople *Jehad*. Had he endorsed it, the effect in Arabia itself would have been electric; and a great Arab chief, who had long been a staunch friend of the British, is known to have declared that he would be powerless in the face of a *Jehad* proclaimed from Mecca. In other parts of the Turkish Empire it would unquestionably have aroused an amount of religious passion which has happily been only rarely displayed during the war even by Turkish Mahomedans. For it may, on the contrary, be readily admitted that in the treatment of their European foe, whether in the battlefield or in captivity, whether prisoners of war or non-combatants who have remained within Turkish territory, the behaviour of the Turks has compared on the whole very favourably with that of their German allies. Even the Armenian massacres, and the cruel proscriptions of Greeks in Asia Minor and of the Lebanon Christians and Jews in Syria, may be put down rather to 'Young Turkish' schemes of Ottomanisation than to any mere outbreak of religious fanaticism.

A brief survey of the effects of the war on the Mahomedan peoples outside Turkey will show that they, too, for the most part repudiated the Turkish attempt to invest it with a religious character.

At a very early stage of his Pan-Islamic propaganda Abdul Hamid had turned his attention to India, and he even started in his own printing press at Yeldiz Kiosk a paper in Persian and Hindustani, called the *Peik-Islam*, for circulation amongst Indian Mahomedans, who were treated with marked distinction whenever they visited Constantinople. His prestige as a great Mahomedan ruler, and as Khalif and guardian of the Holy Places, was considerable with the conservative Mahomedans, and especially the Mahomedan ruling chiefs and great landowners, as well as with the religious leaders of the community. But the respect they entertained for him was purely a religious sentiment, which never affected their political allegiance to the British Crown. They

had from the first regarded the Turkish revolution with disfavour and suspicion; and these feelings were reinforced by the disfavour and suspicion with which they also regarded the 'Young' Mahomedans in their own country, who were the loudest supporters of 'Young Turkey.' The men who started subscriptions for the Red Crescent during the Balkan wars, and rushed to Constantinople to protest their devotion to the Mahomedan cause, were for the most part the same men who, in the opinion of the bulk of their coreligionists in India, were prepared to sacrifice the interests of the Mahomedan community to the Hindus in the pursuit of a political agitation which seemed likely to result only in the substitution of a Hindu ascendancy for the British rule to which they were accustomed. The Balkan wars, moreover, had not enhanced the military prestige of Turkey; and, though the Indian Mahomedans had undoubtedly sympathised with her very keenly in her reverses, there were not a few who felt that she had brought them upon herself by committing her destinies to such a godless generation as the 'Young Turks.'

When England went to war with Germany, the Mahomedan princes and people of India joined wholeheartedly in the Indian rally to the cause of the Empire. Nor was there the slightest faltering amongst the vast majority when Turkey went against us. But there was undeniably an undercurrent of alarm and distress, which a few agitators like Mahomed Ali, one of the leaders of the 'Young' Mahomedan party, who had been in personal contact with the 'Young Turks,' exploited by distorting the aims of British policy and by magnifying the reverses of the Allies in France. The Viceroy hastened to reassure Mahomedan opinion by issuing a full and frank explanation of the circumstances which had driven the British Government into war with Turkey, and a definite announcement that, unless our hands were forced by Turkish military operations, there would be no interference with the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina. As soon as the Indian Expeditionary force reached France, and went into battle shoulder to shoulder with British troops, the feeling uppermost in the minds of all Indians, whether Mahomedans or others, was one of intense pride in the achievements of the Indian army;

and none thrilled more to the stories of its gallant deeds than the Mahomedans with their great martial traditions. Nor did our Mahomedan soldiers ever flinch when they found themselves later on face to face with the Turkish armies in Egypt or in the Dardanelles or in Mesopotamia.

If anything were needed to steady public opinion in India, it was abundantly supplied by the disclosure of the plots and conspiracies hatched in Berlin for promoting revolutionary movements in India by methods of rank anarchism. All through the worst period of Indian unrest, between 1905 and 1910, not a single Mahomedan had ever been associated with political outrages; and, though at the beginning of the war one or two disaffected Mahomedans joined the so-called Indian Department in Berlin, it was not amongst Mahomedans but amongst a small misguided faction of Hindus and Sikhs that the Germans were able to recruit the tools and dupes whose criminal adventures ended so pitifully in the Lahore and Benares and Mandalay conspiracy trials. The internment of Mahomed Ali and his brother Shaukat under the Defence of India Act, and the suppression of the newspapers in which they persisted in carrying on their mischievous attempts to disturb Mahomedan opinion, created very little stir at the time, though the Indian Extremists, Hindus as well as Mahomedans, endeavoured later on to represent them as innocent martyrs for the freedom of the press. The All-India Moslem League, captured by the 'Young Mahomedan' party, indulged last winter in a futile demonstration by electing Mahomed Ali as its President, though he had refused to sign the pledge of good behaviour during the war which would have put an end to his internment; and it even joined with the Indian National Congress in passing political resolutions which, if they were to bring Home Rule to India, would assuredly bring Hindu rule to the Mahomedans. But these manifestations of ill-humour were tempered by loud protestations of loyalty and of unwavering determination to prosecute the war to a victorious end. The very principles professed by those who engineered them excluded all idea of religious sanction.

A more disturbing factor for a time was the revolt of the Sherif of Mecca against Turkish rule, which was

regarded at first by many Indian Mahomedans as attacking the spiritual rather than the temporal authority of the Sultan. The leaders of Mahomedan religious thought in India had from the first discriminated between the Sultan as a temporal Sovereign and the Khalif as a spiritual authority, and were disposed to see in the action of the Sherif of Mecca an attempt to oust the Khalif rather than to overthrow the Sultan. The assumption by the Sherif of the territorial title of King of the Hedjaz went, however, a long way to reassure Mahomedan sentiment; and the reports brought back by Indian pilgrims who travelled to Mecca last year of the vast improvements carried out under his rule have created a considerable reaction in his favour. Altogether, when we bear in mind that the 66,000,000 Mahomedans of India represent at least a third of the whole world of Islam, their splendid loyalty to the British *raj* in a war in which the one great independent Mahomedan power has thrown all its weight into the scales against us, shows conclusively, not that their faith has lost its vitality, but that the cause for which we and they are fighting in no way threatens their faith.

Egypt, unlike India, has seen the war at its very doors. It still formed part, more or less nominally, of the Turkish Empire; and her ruler, Khedive Abbas Hilmi, went over from the very first into our enemies' camp. He had never, it is true, made himself popular with his people, but he stood, nevertheless, for a dynasty which had once done great things, though it had ultimately brought the country to a state of anarchy and ruin from which it was only redeemed by British occupation and control. The immense majority of the population is Mahomedan; and both the Khedive and the Nationalist party, which claims to voice the aspirations of educated 'Young Egypt,' had, each for their own purposes, coquetted in turn with Abdul Hamid's Pan-Islamism and with the anti-British policy of the 'Young Turks.' But the Egyptian people, whose tongue is Arabic, share the Arabs' detestation of Turkish rule; and, though they fretted sometimes under the restraints of British authority, they had not entirely forgotten the days of oppression under the rule of corrupt and high-handed Pashas who, though they called themselves

Egyptians, were mostly of Turkish stock, and spoke Turkish in preference to the Arabic tongue.

When all had been said that rhetorical patriotism could urge against British tutelage, it had brought to the ancient Valley of the Nile not only an unwonted measure of justice and security for life and property, but great material prosperity, chiefly in the shape of vast irrigation works, of which the humblest *fellah* could not but appreciate the value in an essentially agricultural country where water is the alpha and omega of agriculture. The proclamation of a British Protectorate after Turkey came into the war constituted merely a formal change which in no way affected the ordinary life of the country; and, whereas only a small reactionary Palace clique mourned the termination of Abbas Hilmi's Khedivate, the accession of Prince Hussein, with the more exalted title of Sultan, gratified the Egyptians' *amour propre*, whilst preserving the continuity of the dynasty in the person of a ruler who enjoyed universal and well-deserved respect. The attempt that was made on his life merely enhanced his popularity; and, if there were a few fanatical Mahomedans or 'Young Egyptian' anarchists who secretly favoured our enemies, their influence was reduced to a negligible quantity when the first Turkish onslaught on to the Canal was defeated early in 1915. The Senussi movement, which was one of the very few aggressive manifestations of Mahomedan religious feeling produced by the war, might have had more serious consequences if it had not been promptly arrested on the remote desert borders of Western Egypt. The peace of Egypt has fortunately remained unbroken; and the operations of war have merely brought her an increasing volume of commercial wealth and prices never before dreamt of for her labour and her produce. The bulk of her people ask for nothing more.

The Italian hold upon Tripoli was still too recent and too precarious not to be shaken by a war which involved so early a resumption of hostilities between Italy and Turkey. The German officers who had secretly helped Turkey to organise resistance to the Italian armies in 1911—whilst Italy, be it remembered, was still a recognised ally of Germany—had disappeared, but Turkish emissaries were busy in the Tripolitan back-country;

and the Senussis, who had been persuaded by Enver Pasha to forget their traditional hatred of the Turk in the presence of a common danger to Islam, were still more eager to foment trouble against the Italians in Cyrenaica than against the British in Egypt. But even in Tripoli all that Pan-Islamism could effect was to keep the small Italian army of occupation engaged in defensive operations, without, however, affecting Italian authority along the coast.

In Tunis and in her old African province of Algeria France never had any serious cause for anxiety as to the attitude of the Mahomedan populations. In Morocco they doubtless needed careful watching. Active German influences were there to reinforce Mahomedan repugnance to a French protectorate only a few years old; and, with a Spanish Government inclined to show itself at times very subservient to German promptings, the Spanish zone in Morocco was likely to prove a dangerous base of enemy intrigue. Nevertheless Morocco remained, to say the least, quiescent; and France was able not only to withdraw the best part of her white forces from North Africa for service on the Western front, but to employ against Germany, and to her intense disgust, African Mahomedan troops, whose loyalty and gallantry have been proved on many a battlefield, and perhaps never more conspicuously than by a handful of Algerian Spahis who, having been taken prisoners by the Germans, agreed to join the Turkish army in the hope of an easier opportunity of escape and, after many vicissitudes, succeeded in crossing safely over to our lines in Mesopotamia.

The Mahomedan Tatars of the Crimea and the Volga, and even the fiercer tribesmen of the Caucasus and of Transcaspia and Turkestan, appear to have remained loyal to Russian rule until the Revolution, save for one rather serious outburst among the Khirghiz in 1916; and the Khans of Central Asia offered personal service to the Tsar. One of the Russian Generals who distinguished himself at the capture of Erzerum was stated to be a Mahomedan. What has been the attitude of the Mahomedans during the various phases of the Russian Revolution there has been so far little or no trustworthy information to show. The Bolsheviks claim to have triumphantly established their Soviets at Tashkend and

Orenburg, as well as at Tiflis and Baku, where there have been strong revolutionary elements for some years past; but, except as a gospel of plunder, which may well appeal to the old predatory instincts of the wilder tribesmen, the Bolshevik creed is hardly likely to find many adherents amongst genuine Mahomedans.

Bankrupt before the war and only preserved from utter disintegration by an understanding—which she nevertheless deeply resented—between her two powerful neighbours, Persia was fated by her geographical position to suffer almost as much from the war as if she had been herself a belligerent. Though German diplomacy had been doing a great deal of underground work all over Persia, the Shah and his ministers at Teheran were too dependent for their very existence on Great Britain and Russia to depart from the neutrality which was all the Allies demanded of them; and the representatives of the Germanic powers and of Turkey were fain to withdraw demonstratively from the capital as a mark of their high displeasure. But, powerless to make her neutrality respected, Persia saw Turkish and Russian armies carry their warlike operations into her western provinces; and the whole country, carefully surveyed beforehand for the purpose by German agents masquerading as explorers, professors, and commercial agents, was soon overrun by bands in the pay and under the leadership of Germans and Austrians and Turks, which were only slowly and laboriously broken up by a native gendarmerie, raised and organised and officered by the Government of India, though under the Shah's nominal authority. Hatred of Russia rather than any Pan-Islamic sentiment drove the majority of the people of Persia to side, so far as they could safely venture to do so, with the Turks and their Germanic allies. The masses in Persia are fervent Shias, whereas the Turks are Sunnis; and the memory of the extortions practised upon him by the Turkish authorities at Kerbela rankles in the soul of every Persian pilgrim. Among the higher classes, Sufi mysticism (which verges on agnosticism) has long been fashionable; and a *Jihad* was no more likely to appeal to them than to the crude demagoguery of the 'Young Persian' Nationalists of the Teheran *mejliss*, who journeyed to Berlin to thank the German Chancellor

for his public assurances of Germany's friendship for Persia, and subsequently went to Brest Litovsk to place their views before the peace negotiators. How far the collapse of Russia, and the announcement recently made by the British Government that the clauses of the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 are therefore no longer operative, will affect the attitude of the Persian Government or of the Persian people it is impossible as yet to forecast, and there are other big factors in the making, to which I shall allude presently.

The one region in which Mahomedan fanaticism has really been stirred by the war is Afghanistan and the wild Indo-Afghan borderland. Since the Afghan wars of 1879-80, both the old Ameer Abdulrahman and his son Habibullah, who succeeded him in 1901, have faithfully observed the treaties governing their relations with the Indian Empire, which enjoys the right to control their intercourse with other Powers, and grants to them in return a fixed annual subsidy and various trade facilities. The old Ameer and his successor have visited India; and official missions from the Indian Government have occasionally been received at Kabul. Permission is very rarely accorded to non-official Europeans to enter Afghanistan, but large Afghan caravans come down annually into India, and the Ameer himself employs a small number of Englishmen as experts for his public works, and treats them well and even generously. Habibullah resented the provisions of the Anglo-Russian Convention, though it effectively guaranteed the rights and interests of Afghanistan, because he was not consulted during the negotiations—also perhaps because he realised that he would no longer be able on occasion to exploit the rivalry of his two powerful neighbours; and he never signified his assent to them. But, like his father, he appreciated the value of British friendship, and unlike his father, who was a conservative Oriental despot of the old type, he does not regard the adoption of certain Western fashions and habits of life as inconsistent with his Mahomedan orthodoxy. He goes regularly to mosque on Sundays and performs his daily devotions, but he motors and plays golf, and habitually wears European clothes. While in India, he even became a Freemason to please Lord Kitchener, though

his people regard Freemasonry with deep suspicion as savouring of infidelity; for the Afghans, who are Sunni Mahomedans, are still fiercely fanatical.

The Ameer was, therefore, in a difficult position when, in 1914, he was not only advised by the Viceroy to maintain a strict neutrality, but urged also to set his face resolutely against any manifestations of religious fanaticism after our rupture with Turkey. For the news of the *Jehad* proclaimed at Constantinople reached quickly into Afghanistan, and was soon followed by swarms of Turkish and German emissaries who had travelled across Persia. Nowhere did the report that the German Emperor had turned Mahomedan find readier credence; and the Afghan bazaars were alive with rumours that a large German-Turkish army was on the march to drive the English infidels out of Asia. The hungry Afghan tribesmen thrilled to the prospect of carrying fire and sword once more into the rich plains and cities of Hindustan; and even amongst the Ameer's principal serdars and his own nearest kinsmen there was a strong party that urged him to lose no time in joining in the Holy War which the whole swarm of fanatical *Mullahs* were preaching in every mosque. Habibullah had no mind to yield, but he recognised the necessity of temporising. When a body of German and Turkish officers, announcing themselves as an embassy from the Kaiser and the Sultan, were passed on by the Governor of Herat to Kabul, the Ameer entertained them hospitably, but otherwise kept them at arms' length, until after some months a pointed hint that they might outstay their welcome induced them to depart empty-handed. In the councils he frequently held, he extolled the virtues of prudence and patience and exhorted his serdars to 'wait and see.' He allowed the fanaticism of his people to blow off steam, but, while he improved the occasion to obtain an increase of his Indian subsidy, he kept on renewing to the Viceroy, and even in autograph letters to the King-Emperor, his assurances of unswerving friendship, and he carried them out faithfully on the whole. He had a particularly difficult time to weather after the fall of Kut, until the conquest of Baghdad restored the prestige of British arms; and he was powerless to prevent, though he did a good deal to discountenance,

so far as his authority extended, the numerous risings of the border tribesmen who harried our North-west India frontier during 1915 and 1916, and were frequently reinforced by kindred bodies of Afghans. Like the great rising in 1898, every one of these risings, which for over two years were a constant source of anxiety to the Government of India and sometimes necessitated the employment of bigger forces than it was easy to spare when India had been drained for the larger theatres of war, could be traced to the exhortations of well-known *Mullahs* fired by the message of the *Jehad*.

The failure of Pan-Islamism to fulfil the hopes of the Turkish rulers and of their wirepullers in Berlin seems to have induced the 'Young Turks' to put their money on a new movement, known as the Pan-Turanian movement, which is a projection of Turkish Nationalism, or Ottomanisation, far beyond the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire. This Turkish irredentist movement is not based, like other irredentist movements, on the actual existence of national groups, however small, clamouring for reunion with the parent stock from which they have been forcibly or accidentally severed. Its promoters have merely studied large maps of Asia and explored its ancient history in order to discover amongst its existing populations some traces of linguistic or racial affinity or legendary traditions, which can be twisted to subserve the purposes of a connexion with the ruling race of the Turkish Empire; and, where everything else fails, they have thrown in Islam to supply the missing nexus. None of these populations has ever displayed the slightest consciousness of any other connexion with the Turks, except a common religion, nor the slightest desire to seek its political salvation under Turkish patronage. Whilst irredentism in other countries connotes a two-fold movement of the peoples who yearn to be reunited with the parent nation, and of the parent nation equally bent on achieving their reunion, Turkish irredentism is, at present at least, an entirely one-sided movement, which has in the first place to create the desire, not for reunion—since there has never been union in the past—but for a future union, for which the essentials are lacking.

So artificial is this Turkish irredentism that it

has had to borrow for its name a non-Turkish word. Pan-Turanianism is derived from the old Persian word *Turan*, which is used in Persian poetry in contradistinction to the word *Iran*, to distinguish between the barbarian, non-Persian-speaking peoples of Central Asia and the inhabitants of *Iran*, with its superior civilisation and Persian culture. The Turkish inventors of Pan-Turanianism were not, it must be assumed, aware of the significance of this derivation, or they would scarcely have adopted the word for a movement directed, amongst other aims, to bringing Iranian Persia into subordinate alliance with Pan-Turanian Turkey. They probably took it over from European philologists, who coined, rather carelessly, the word Turanian to cover all the agglutinative languages of Eastern Europe and Central Asia which, in contrast to the Indo-European type of languages, build up their word-forms by a process of 'agglutination.' Of these languages, to which Hungarian and Finnish also belong structurally, Turkish is the most widely spread in Asia, as its different dialects are spoken by a variety of peoples extending from European Turkey through Asia Minor and the Caucasus, the northern provinces of Persia and Afghanistan, right into Russian and even Chinese Turkestan, as well as in a more broken chain round the northern shores of the Black Sea and the Caspian to the valley of the Great Volga river and far up into Siberia.

The one substantial basis of Pan-Turanianism is therefore linguistic. According to Turkish Pan-Turanian estimates, which must be taken *cum grano*, the people who talk the various Turkish dialects number altogether over twenty-seven millions, distributed as follows :

Osmanli Turks of the Ottoman Empire . . . . .	8,000,000
Crimean Tatars . . . . .	200,000
Kazan, Astrakhan, and other Tatars in the basin of the Volga . . . . .	1,500,000
West Siberian Tatars . . . . .	150,000
Yakuts in the basin of the Lena, Northern Siberia . . . . .	250,000
Caucasus Tatars . . . . .	2,000,000
Tatars of Central Asia :	
Semi-nomadic Bashkirs . . . . .	2,400,000
Nomadic Kirghiz . . . . .	4,700,000

Turkomans, nomadic and sedentary . . . . .	3,000,000
Khiva and Bokhara Khanates . . . . .	1,500,000
Chinese Turkestan . . . . .	1,000,000
Northern provinces of Persia and Afghanistan . . . . .	3,000,000

More than half of these, it will be seen, are, or were, subjects of Russia, located for the most part in Central Asia, between the Volga and Caspian to the west, the Trans-Siberian Railway to the north, the Altai Mountains to the east, and the Pamirs to the south. A still larger majority are on an extremely low plane of civilisation, many of them still in the nomadic stage.

The Turkish Pan-Turanians, probably conscious of the difficulty of building up the 'cultural' value of Pan-Turanianism out of such materials, however useful as a linguistic basis, are quite prepared to invoke at the same time either the identity of religious beliefs or a community of political interests, just as the one or the other best suits their purpose. All these peoples are Mahomedans; and although the foundations of new Turkey must be laid in a virile nationalism, she is obviously destined, according to the Pan-Turanians, to be their overlord, as spiritual and political leader of Islam. As one of the results of the present war, all the Turanian races subject to Russia must of course regain their independence under the ægis of Turkey; and those Mahomedan states which are now already independent, but whose existence has been threatened by the aggressive ambitions of the Western European powers, must seek their salvation in close political union with her, especially if their geographical position, as in the case of Persia and Afghanistan, favours such union. Moreover, the northern provinces of Persia are actually inhabited by a Turkish-speaking people of Turanian stock, which has supplied also the reigning Kajar dynasty; and so are the northern provinces of Afghanistan, which only ceased to form independent Khanates about the middle of the 19th century. Pan-Turanianism would fain spread its net even over India, for were not the Mahomedan conquerors of Hindustan and the Moghul Emperors 'Turanians' from Central Asia, and did not the House of Timur hold its court at Delhi until its last

representatives were wiped out by the British oppressor little more than half a century ago? Turkey is naturally cast in the Pan-Turanian Empire of the future for the part that Prussia plays in the German Empire, while to Persia is allotted the part of Bavaria—a suggestion which is possibly intended to take sectarian differences also into account, for, just as Prussia is predominantly Protestant and Bavaria Roman Catholic, so does the Sunni form of Mahomedanism predominate in Turkey and the Shia form in Persia.

It is interesting to note how closely the promoters of Pan-Turanianism have studied Pan-German literature and modelled their own aims and methods upon those of Pan-Germanism. They make no secret of their conviction that the present alliance between Turkey and Germany is 'no mere whim of destiny,' but 'the conscious expression' not merely of an unconscious brotherhood in arms which has existed between the two nations for a thousand years against one common enemy—the Slavs—but of a complete community of national ideals pursued along parallel lines of national evolution and expansion. A circular issued by the Committee of Union and Progress on the day of the declaration of war between Turkey and the Entente Powers not only gives the Turkish version of the circumstances which had gradually brought about a 'moral alliance' between Turkey and Germany, but lays special stress on the 'moral grounds' for which she was now entering the war to vindicate her national ideal and to secure the independence of the world of Islam, whose friend and protector the German Emperor had long ago proclaimed himself to be. The charter of Pan-Turanianism might have been drafted in Berlin just as well as in Constantinople.

Equally flavoured with Pan-Germanism is the stress constantly laid by the apostles of Pan-Turanianism on its 'cultural' mission. Just as the Germans are trying to expunge all words of French origin from their vocabulary, so the Pan-Turians would banish Arabic and Persian from the Turkish language. Only their task is vastly more difficult, as, Turkish having been originally the language of primitive and totally uncivilised tribesmen, the Osmanli Turks, when their conquests brought them into closer contact with the superior civilisation

of the Arabs and the Persians, borrowed from them bodily all the terms, and especially all the abstract terms, of which they had hitherto never felt the need, and adapted them with very slight modifications to the different structure of their own language. To the present day the polite literature of Turkey is a mosaic of Persian and Arabic terms embedded in a Turkish framework. Yet the *Türk Bilgi Derneği*, an 'Academy of Turkish Knowledge,' is devoting itself to the diffusion of the *Yeni Lisan*, or New Language; and the Pan-Turanians have undertaken to translate even the Koran into Turkish, though Mahomedans have always maintained that their sacred book is not capable of translation, since any translation from the original Arabic must outrage the sanctity of a revelation conveyed to Mahomed in the very words in which he transmitted it to the Faithful. The old guilds and corporations have also been reorganised on a nationalist basis with Unions of Turkish Merchants and Turkish Consumers, ready on occasion to enforce nationalism in the economic domain by boycotting all non-Turkish competitors. Other associations promote nationalist ideals in literature and art and even in sport. Turkish ladies have devoted themselves to the social side of the movement; and the Turkish Boy Scouts, under Enver Pasha's special patronage, are stated to be of an essentially Turkish, and very superior, brand. They shout for the Khakan of the Turks and not for the Padishah, as the Turkish army has always done, and they carry flags not with the Ottoman crescent but with the pre-Islamic Turkish Wolf. One of the most significant features of Pan-Turanianism is the cult of Attila and Jenghiz Khan and Hulagu as 'national' heroes, and a reversion in search of patriotic symbols to Turanian paganism.

The collapse of Russia undoubtedly opens up to Pan-Turanianism unexpected possibilities of political expansion. Now that the Russian armies have melted away in Asia as well as in Europe, we shall probably see the Turks follow the example of their German Allies and march into the Caucasus and perhaps into North-Western Persia, to rescue their coreligionists from Bolshevism and restore order—in the interests, of course, of humanity. With Russia out of the field, British influence may

possibly be too remote to counteract for the moment the increasing pressure of Turks and Germans on the Shah's Government in Teheran; and out of the welter in Russian Central Asia there may emerge a Mahomedan revival which would draw both the nomadic tribesmen and the sedentary population of the old Khanates within the orbit of Turkish nationalism. The effects might be felt in Afghanistan itself, which would be relieved of all Russian menace from the northern banks of the Oxus.

The position in the Middle East may thus be modified in the immediate future to our serious disadvantage, and open up even the borderlands of India to Turco-German aggression. But the alliance between Pan-Germanism and Pan-Turanianism can hardly be permanent, and there are elements of weakness in Pan-Turanianism itself which are bound in the long run to defeat the achievement of its programme. Its most enthusiastic exponents in Constantinople admit that Turkey cannot hope to ride both horses, Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turanianism, at the same time; and they declare quite openly that, of the two, the Nationalist horse is the one they must run to win. They can only use Pan-Islamism as a pace-maker. They are, in fact, conscious that between the two ideals there is a conflict which may be postponed or smoothed over for a time, but is ultimately inevitable. There are, indeed, signs that in Turkey itself all the elements of a conflict are already present, though the war keeps them for the present under restraint. Such measures as the diversion of the revenues administered by the Department of the *Evkaf* from the time-honoured purposes of pious foundations to the creation of a 'National' Bank, and other undertakings for the economic restoration of the country on 'National' lines, the transformation of the *Medresses*, or schools in which little else but the Koran and Mahomedan theology have been expounded, into 'National' schools for the teaching of 'Turkology' and other profane sciences, the transfer to the Civil Courts of a considerable portion of the jurisdiction hitherto reserved to the *Sheria* or religious courts, are measures which profoundly affect not only Mahomedan orthodox traditions, but many powerful vested interests. To the innate conservatism of the Turkish masses all the social innovations of the Nationalist movement must be

as repugnant as to the higher classes the breach effected in the seclusion of the harem by the appearance of women in public life, or the appointment of a notorious agnostic to the high office of Sheik-ul-Islam.

To the non-Turkish Mahomedans the subordination of Pan-Islamism to Turkish Nationalism must be even more repellent. Under the stress of war the Pan-Turians profess themselves willing to allow the Arabs of Egypt, Tunisia and Morocco complete independence in their own affairs, and even to respect the 'cultural' rights of the Arabs in Asiatic Turkey. But the offer comes too late, for Mecca, the shrine *par excellence* of all Arab Mahomedan aspirations, has already thrown off the Turkish yoke; the Arabs of Mesopotamia and Palestine have welcomed their British liberators; the whole of Syria impatiently awaits their approach; and the Arab populations of Northern Africa have remained deaf throughout the war to Pan-Islamic appeals from Constantinople. Are any Arabs likely to listen to the voice of a charmer who lays a sacrilegious hand on the Koran, banishes all the 'cultural' influences of Arabic from his own tongue, and openly declares that the Turks' idea of God is different from that of the Arabs, and that, with the profound differences which exist between the social life of Semitic Arabs and that of the Mongolian Turks, it is impossible for the Turks to accept the Arab interpretation of the Mahomedan religion? Will the Persians, who are Shiahs, and cannot therefore for a moment entertain the claims of a Khalif who is a Turk and a Sunni to the spiritual headship of Islam, be any more willing to accept a temporal overlordship based on the supremacy of Turkish nationalism? There is, it is true, a community of race between the Turks and the Azerbaijanis and other populations of Northern Persia, where the lower classes speak a Turkish dialect; but even there the upper classes are as proud of their national tongue and their national literature as the pure Persians of Isfahan and Shiraz. The whole nationalist movement in Persia during the last decade clashes at every point, except for a momentary coincidence of political animosities, with Turkish nationalism; and, if the Kajar dynasty has fretted under the alien tutelage which it brought upon itself by its own incompetency and misrule, is it likely

that, when the downfall of Russia has automatically brought that tutelage to an end, the Shah will put his head voluntarily into a still tighter Turkish noose?

Nor is Pan-Turanianism likely to appeal to the Ameer of Afghanistan, who has always taken pride in styling himself *Malik-ul-Islam* or King of Islam. Its 'cultural' claims will certainly be entirely wasted on the wild tribesmen of Central Asia, though their ignorant fanaticism may be more easily duped by its appeal to their religion and by the encouragement it will doubtless willingly give to all the appetites which Russian rule has hitherto curbed. Amongst Indian Mahomedans one may safely assume that the very slight impression made by Abdul Hamid's Pan-Islamic propaganda, already weakened before the war by the Turkish Revolution and the dubious orthodoxy of the Young Turks, will prove to have been entirely wiped out both by Turkey's active cooperation with Germany in a war of which they have shared the sacrifices and the glories with the whole British Empire, and by the open substitution of nationalism for Islamic ideals in the Pan-Turanian programme.

Unless the power of the ruling clique in Constantinople is finally crushed during the war, Pan-Turanianism may be a disturbing element for many years to come in Western and Central Asia. But it cannot conceivably repair the breach which its alliance with Pan-Germanism has made in the House of Islam, so long as the vast majority of the world's Mahomedans, who have loyally stood to their allegiance to the Western Powers in the face of Turkey and turned deaf ears to the *Jehad* she has vainly presumed to preach, have a firm and continued assurance that their religion is as safe in the hands of their non-Mahomedan rulers as are their temporal interests.

VALENTINE CHIROL.

## Art. 12.—CHILD EDUCATION IN INDIA. ✓

THE national life of a people is embodied in the manner of its education. The schooling and apprenticeship which it evolves for the training and discipline of its youth are a mirror reflecting national ideals and aspirations, national aims and beliefs. By looking to the system of learning under which a student grows from childhood to maturity we discover the material from which his thought is fed, the purposes and relative values which his mind is trained to accept. The ideal education is a continuous development, building-up the firm chain of succession, establishing harmoniously the sense of causation and sequence, the strength of united purpose and action, and the value and importance of combination. Where national life is normal and consistent, we find educational methods correspondingly continuous and natural, expressing, as well as forming, the temper of the people. Accepting this view of education as a national function, we recognise that the principles of education must be constantly challenged, its practice constantly revised, according to the changing demands of the times. The lessons of recent experience have emphasised this necessity for vigilance; and the problems of education must be faced with equal regard for the needs of individual self-development, of vocational efficiency and of national service.

The need of wisdom and foresight in inaugurating revised educational methods in India is proportionately more urgent than with us, as the difficulties to be met are more intricate and complex. The system of school and college education which has the authority of official sanction, and constitutes the direct approach to public life and office, has hitherto been built up on English models. Hence the tendency, among those to whom the task of educational administration in British India is entrusted, has been to discuss its problems on lines almost parallel with those of modern England, to assume similar difficulties and no others, and to search for similar solutions to those difficulties. Here, in England, the educational questions of the moment may seem to be debated almost exclusively with a view to school curricula and university courses, but it must be remembered

that the years of 'nursery' and 'kindergarten' training, when imagination is most vigorous, observation most acute, memory most retentive, are provided for by an inherited discipline which political problems have never touched, and by a development which our national re-awakening, combined with the more scientific methods of the modern teaching art, has splendidly enriched. The policy of education in India, which has accepted an exotic and arbitrary scheme as the basis of school and collegiate learning, of necessity precludes any continuity of mental training between the stages of childhood and student life; and the preliminary period of child development has been, as a result, almost entirely neglected. Now, this period is manifestly of the highest importance for all subsequent growth, since, during these early years, the faculties of sense must be awakened and disciplined, perceptions and powers of discrimination developed, direction given to mental habits which will determine the course they take during adolescent and adult life. What the preparing of the soil is in horticulture—and without it all later effort may be in great measure unproductive—that is the training of the child, at home and in the class-room, in lesson and in game, in the higher culture of human development.

Experience and observation of the particular needs of child training have led, in practically every country of the West, to similar conclusions. Lessons of obedience can begin with infancy; and a wise mother or trained nurse can encourage in the infant, even before it can speak, rudimentary instincts of regularity, method and self-control, as well as intelligent response to certain outside influences and impressions. Recognition of the rights of others can be implanted in babyhood; system may be observed in games as well as in the daily routine of living. In the next stage the child's restless mental and bodily activity is regulated and developed by occupations that interest and hold the attention. The most recent cultivation of music as an active experience—a rediscovery of the true and original purposes of the musical art—is now becoming recognised as an æsthetic discipline and culture of the widest influence. Eye and ear are further trained in drawing and nature-study; and manual dexterity is acquired in many practical

branches of handicraft. The vast literature of childhood, ranging from the simpler stories and rhymes of legend or fancy, through epic tales of valour and romance, to the striving, suffering and accomplishment of saints or heroes, peoples the child-mind with ideas of permanent value, gives understanding of human nature and conduct, and implants the conception of honour and self-sacrifice. So trained, the child of, say, from seven to nine years of age, who may, perhaps, have learned no actual lessons, has progressed far in culture and education, has acquired a standard (though not yet conscious) in art, literature, and conduct, and is truly prepared, in the coming years of school-life, not merely to learn but to discriminate, select, and use his individual judgment. These are critical years of infant and child life, not merely in the houses of the wealthy but, more or less, in every representative class of life. The teacher may be mother, nurse, governess, or school-mistress, but the lessons are of the same kind.

Now, what is the provision made for the corresponding years of childhood in India? The course and routine of childhood is necessarily determined by the conditions of home-life; and the life of the Indian home is distracted at the present day by a tremendous unsettlement. There exists no uniformity in upbringing, no accepted standard, no common aim scientifically pursued. With few exceptions, the only children trained systematically in infancy and earlier childhood (apart from the scattered units who attend Christian missionary institutions in their earliest years) are those who are brought under the influence of certain reforming bodies of recent growth, which wisely seek to disseminate their propaganda through a social and religious training along national lines. Until recently there existed a very definite idea of home-education, more adapted, perhaps, to developing the qualities of reverence, dignity, patience, kindness—the time-honoured virtues of Indian culture—than to training individual powers, or imparting knowledge, other than the traditional lore of the ancient epics. But this tradition has become less and less operative as the home has come to be, within the last generation or so, increasingly out of sympathy with the aims and methods of scholastic training along Western lines, and with all the factors that determine success or prosperity in modern

active life. At the present day, the best representative traditions of the home have been largely undermined by bewilderment and indifference—the failure of the past to deal adequately with its own problems, and the apathy of the present, where security imposed from without has robbed the people of all incentive towards national growth and progress. Among the poorer agricultural classes—the vast majority of India's population—whom state education has hardly touched, and upon whom their own traditional culture is fast losing its hold, the child grows up in utter ignorance, neglected in body and mind, unreasoning and unthinking, influenced mainly by the cruder superstitions of past ages, the bonds of caste, and the baneful customs of ancient and tyrannous convention.

The old Sanskrit and Koranic learning, which formed the guiding principle of thought and the source of mind-culture, which inspired the ideals and moulded the manners of every age and class, was an influence of more consistent and universal appeal than anything which our briefer and more chequered history has enabled us to develop. The advent of new ideas from the West would not, by themselves, have dispossessed this ancient education, even though its vitality had sunk to a low ebb; but the new orientation which an English government of necessity brought with it, introducing new purposes, new methods, new values, into every department of human life, meant a hopeless break-up of the old *régime*. Moreover, the experiment of modern Western education, imposed upon certain sections of the male population, between certain stages of their development, introduced, as it was, partially, arbitrarily, and with little reference to the events and surroundings of daily life, was bound to lead to the present chaos and confusion. Thus the home continues to reproduce the life of a bygone age pathetically robbed of purpose and meaning, because unrelated to the needs of to-day, while education widens the gulf, by imparting to the schoolboy lessons of which the subjects lack that harmony of sequence and method which could give them a living meaning, imparting them, moreover, in a foreign tongue, which he but seldom wholly masters. The language of his infancy remains to him, therefore, more often than not, a mere *patois* for domestic needs; and the language

which he acquires in school-days, and for public life, may be no more than a pedagogic speech adapting itself but clumsily to the expression of his thoughts. In such surroundings the Indian child of the present day can have few of the benefits of modern system, of scientific or psychological experience in its early up-bringing, while the old-fashioned discipline of traditional culture may scarcely be regarded as an active or a living influence.

In no country in the world, perhaps, except India, do we find this strange anomaly of the Old and the New continuing side by side within the same house, the same family, often the same individual (for early influence is strong), separate, unreconciled, in perpetual silent warfare one with another. Moreover, conflict and antagonism between the affairs of the outer world of work and business, and the administration of the home, with its ceremonies of religion, its marriage customs, its complex social structure, is bound to persist so long as women live a life apart untutored and untrained. The problems of India's future progress are necessarily bound up with the education of its women and must find their ultimate solution inside the home, by men and women in cooperation. The true traditions of Indian womanhood will readily concede to woman her place in the evolution of intellectual and spiritual culture; and history confirms it as the revival of a lost ideal, realised in the days of India's greatness, and firmly established in her social order. If primary education became universal, the same for boy and girl alike, for rich and poor, for every caste and community, assimilation would inevitably take place, and the situation might become normal almost within one generation. But an educational reform on so large a scale is a matter for legislation, and lies outside my argument.

Meantime, by what methods can Indian reformers best counter the prevalent disorder of mind and spirit which pervades the home? How can they best secure to the infant life of to-day that robustness and sanity of development so vitally necessary to the generation which must solve in practical experience the problems and theories of to-day? For India is no longer helpless, passive, inert. The restless vigour of her new awakening has made trial of its forces in countless different experiments during the last decade or more; but the gradual

rise of the spirit of nationality is now claiming all these energies for a single united purpose. Every department of life and thought is stirring to fresh activity; and the vitality of its promise is most surely proved by the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice which the new creed everywhere arouses. The movement is alive, beyond all question; among its leaders and supporters are men of the widest range of thought and study, advanced thinkers mentally at grips with problems and difficulties by which we of the West are never faced—men who take a passionate pride in their country and the great heritage of its past, who yet realise the obstacles it must surmount before it can become emancipated and play its part in active modern life.

Above all, it is necessary to secure that continuity between past and future without which no effort can boast a stable foundation. The necessity for continuous growth and evolution has not always been recognised in Europe, but it has never been defied with impunity. In India the principle of growth from within is even more fundamentally important, by reason of her long antecedent civilisation and the strong instinct of conservatism in the life of every class. The New Renaissance of the East is a movement of the widest possible scope. Elements of the successive waves which came to Europe in the advent of the New Learning, the Reformation of the 16th century, and the national revival of the 19th, are all present in the quickening of Young India of to-day. The course which this movement will take is as yet undetermined; we only know that everything which India's past civilisation has accumulated of literature, art, music, and spiritual culture, has felt the stimulus of new life, and will play its part in the moulding of New India out of the present turmoil.

The practical results of the modern Nationalist revival in Europe are now incarnated in the education of the child of this generation; and the lessons of national growth and evolution are thus secured to future generations by being implanted upon the child imagination during its most impressionable years. The influences of childhood are, without doubt, the most permanent and indelible. Even accidental impressions received at this period have a tendency to dominate subconscious thought

and so to determine action, as modern psychology, confirming the old Jesuit adage, has recognised. The need, therefore, of a childhood training which shall embody the nation's ideals is clearly of the first necessity for India's future progress. This nurture and training of the child is normally the province of the home and properly the work of women. But, until the home is prepared to perform its part, devoted reformers can do much to enable modern educational science to utilise the resources of India's national heritage for the mental and physical culture of young children. There are signs that such a change is already coming.

In recent years, and for the first time, a children's literature is slowly growing up in Bengal—a literature of Indian tales and legends illustrated with Indian pictures. But the beginnings are still small and local, and the need is national. This task must not be postponed to some more convenient season or relegated to the leisure moments of busy men, to be dealt with when the claims of public office and of affairs have been satisfied. The mind of the child is unceasingly active and receptive; his hunger for knowledge about the world he lives in is constant, and should be wisely fed. The world of history, literature and legend is full of incident and movement, adventure and romance. The stories they yield must be told with skill and sympathy, simply and with sincerity. The wonders of nature, the life of forest, plain and river, of bird and beast, of tree and flower, are the intimate comrades of childhood. Vision and understanding are needed to interpret even the outer meaning of these, to explain their forms and phases, their purpose and development, and their relation to human life. Colour and song—innate expressions of Indian æsthetic genius—and the rhythm of ordered movement as well as of sound, have been too long banished from so-called practical life. These must become considered agents in awakening and training the perceptions and faculties of childhood. All the elements, in short, which will take their share in the social reconstruction of the future, must be brought together in harmonious combination to form the environment of the child of to-day.

The narrow pedantry of the 19th century, which

taught by rule and rote, by weary memorising of dead formulæ, together with the Spencerian doctrines and materialistic codes of the period, have ceased to be a danger to us in the West. A wave of Hellenism, which always brings with it a return to nature and new life, has delivered us from that particular bondage. But a late outcrop, transplanted by Macaulay and his early Victorian associates, still flourishes in India, in school and college, in the thought and conversation of the 'literate' classes. Deliverance must come to India through her own effort, by an ardent cultivation of the ancient arts, the ancient learning and wisdom, along the lines which modern educational and psychological science has discovered for our use, in such a way as to sow the seeds of a sturdy and self-reliant national growth in the fertile soil of childhood's training-ground.

By such means is it possible to awaken living interests, to appeal to inborn instincts and inherited associations, and thereby to train a character which shall discover both purpose and inspiration in the land of its birth. For each nation must inevitably find growth, direction and energy from within, before it can realise its true destiny, and bring to the common treasure-house of the world's civilisations the gift of its own particular and distinctive genius. For three generations, or more, under the security of the 'Pax Britannica,' the national art of India has declined, education has been perverted, activity deflected from its normal course; thought has become atrophied, culture is suspended. The chastisement of our peace is upon them.

The civilisation of India has dwindled, during this period, to a memory, its cults and ceremonies to a lifeless observance; the motives and practice of daily life are sought from without. But for the jealous custody of their heritage by the women—at all times and in all countries the natural guardians of national culture—even the memory might have taken its place with the history of the past, and the links of the chain have been severed beyond all possibility of reunion. For the effort to revive a disused speech or an obsolete custom has never yet produced a national result; its utmost achievement is to stimulate interest and research among the learned, and to provide material for antiquarian discussion.

India's civilisation, however, is not dead but dormant; and the spell of its long sleep is at last being broken. The renaissance of the present day seeks inspiration and guidance at its source. But with the reaction against the passive inertia of generations comes a certain danger from emotionalism—the mesmerism of bygone glories and the tendency to perpetuate past failings and ignorance because they form a part of sacred tradition. As it is the province of woman to guard and to preserve, so it must be the task of enlightened women to select that which is worthy of preservation and reject all that is no longer relevant. It is theirs to save and defend the vital element in tradition, the living heritage of faith and understanding, the special aspect of truth and beauty which finds separate embodiment in every people, grows with their growth and progresses with their progress.

With the awakening of a national consciousness, the motives for national reform have now become insistent. The outward expression of these motives—a symptom of all pioneer work—remains hitherto isolated and spasmodic. The tendency to theorise and debate, to discuss political actions and reactions, to deal with symptoms and externals, is still somewhat exaggerated. It is in the nurseries of to-day that the forces must be fostered and organised which will hereafter work out the regeneration of India in harmony and cooperation; and this child-nurture should be made the first and permanent charge upon the time, energy, and expenditure of all the reforming zeal which now seeks an outlet.

Finally, we must remember that, though the building up of India's future in the light of the present national revival must incontestably be planned and carried out by Indians and for Indians, the experience touches not India alone but all mankind. The world at large will be not only spectator but partaker of its results. When the light of Classic thought and Classic culture—the rediscovered treasures of Hellenic genius—dawned upon the darkened understanding of mediæval Europe, the day of a new era was born, and modern civilisation came into being. So, to complete the cycle, the impulse of modern thought and modern progress was carried in the last century to the Classic East. The normal effects of such a contact were, for the time being, delayed through

artifice and experiment on the part of Anglo-Indian opinion. The 'Orientalists' would hear of no contamination of the new-found treasures of Eastern learning; the 'Anglicists' had no thought but to clean the slate and inscribe upon it the writing of the West. In the event, India has, to the outward eye, lain dormant under the imposition of an alien culture, substituted for her own, but never adapted to her needs. Yet the fruit of an unwilling union was maturing, in spite of conflict and reluctance; and the rebirth of to-day, however ardently national in form, owes its incentive to the direct influence of the West upon the East.

Throughout all recorded history the great civilisations of East and West have held singularly aloof from one another in all their inmost experiences. Conquest, invasion, and trade have effected an intercourse between the two in external dealings which has but deepened the instincts of mutual reserve. To-day we must learn a new lesson—that a freer interchange of thought and ideas between different peoples endangers nothing of permanent value, and obliterates only those characteristics which accident has fostered, while enriching the elements of their several strength. In its response to the stimulus of an outside influence, the culture of a people, no less than the character of an individual, can best realise its own purposes and powers, and achieve its highest self-development. Therefore, if the destinies of East and West are knit together at the present day, and for so long as the partnership may continue, let each see to it that the union may be productive of the best results, without compromise of sentiment or of conviction on either side, and lay the foundations of a larger development and a wider achievement than the world has yet witnessed.

E. AGNES R. HAIGH.

✓  
Art. 13.—STOPFORD BROOKE.

*The Life and Letters of Stopford Brooke.* By Lawrence Pearsall Jacks. Two vols. John Murray, 1917.

STOPFORD BROOKE died in 1916 at the age of eighty-four. His remarkable faculties were alert, serenely untouched by age, to the end; less than a week before his death he wrote a letter to Mr Rothenstein, summarising a philosophy of life, giving brave encouragement to the painter in his work, rejoicing in the white frost that for three weeks had etched his Surrey landscape, and speaking with critical distinction of the poetry of Thomas Hardy—'one of the few men who cut into the quick of humanity.' In spite of a good deal of ill-health, few men have spent as many days as he of vigorous life, or touched experience so widely or so robustly. In the sense of being responsive to every manifestation of the earth and humanity, it would be difficult to find anywhere a richer nature than that recorded in this book. Mr Jacks has done his work with almost flawless tact. It is, perhaps, to be wished that a biographer who knew Brooke so intimately and with such sympathy had given his own impressions a little wider scope; but, since it has clearly been his wish to allow his subject to speak for himself with as little commentary as possible, it would be ungracious to complain of a method that can point to the highest examples. The material for the writing of a life so long and active as Brooke's must have been very voluminous; it is here selected and arranged with a skill and discretion that leave before us a personality complete in every feature.

*non-in-law*  
The first reflexion that comes to the mind of the reader, on reaching the end of these two substantial volumes, is that it is not a little strange that a career which, in spite of its many remarkable aspects, was not quite of the rarest distinction in its relation to its own time, and finally left little in the way of durable and tangible addition to the sum of human achievement, should justify so exhaustive an analysis. For that this biography is justified, not only for its own shapely composition, but by the quality of its subject, there can be no doubt. It may be interesting to enquire why this is

so, since by usual standards it might be in question. It is possible for a poor subject to inspire a brilliant biography, but Mr Jacks in his grave simplicity of manner makes no claim to brilliance; also it is possible for a poorly executed record to acquire some permanent interest through the importance of its subject, but in this case there is never for a moment the feeling that the writer is supporting rather than being directed by his theme. As a biography the book is, in the generous use of the word, adequate; it scores no points outside Brooke's personality, it never falls below that personality's demands. And yet, while the book does this, we are left with a strange feeling of difficulty when we seek exactly to define the qualities in Brooke that called for this elaborate treatment.

In his Irish blood Stopford Brooke carried a strain of English, Scottish and Welsh descent. Childhood spent in a devoted family, with enough substance to make for the liberal decencies but without the excess that saps independent effort, was followed by a life that in its external movement was one of almost unbroken success. At twenty-five he was freely accepted if not already courted by intellectual and fashionable London, and working at the same time with tireless energy as a parish priest in a slum neighbourhood. Already the Broad Church party considered him to be a suitable person to entrust with the writing of F. W. Robertson's *Life*, a task that they looked upon as of critical importance to their position in the ecclesiastical controversies of the time. He had all the natural gifts that make at once for popularity and respect. A splendid appearance — 'My word! you *are* a strapper!' said a poor woman of his congregation on his arrival in London—a fine voice, a ready turn of speech, a very courteous wit, a love of gallant manners and a fearless regard for the truth springing from a passionate realisation of the dignity of life, made him one of the most notable and welcome figures in the more thoughtful social world of his long day. A pleasant instance of the humorous good sense that gave him so just a popularity in a large circle of friends may be gathered from an entry in his diary made when he was an old man:

'Morris I first knew in 1867, forty years ago. I met him first at a dinner given by Colvin. He didn't care for parsons, and he glared at me when I said something about good manners. Leaning over the table, with his eyes set, and his fist clenched, he shouted at me, "I am a boor, and a son of a boor." As he meant to be rude I was excessively polished. "I couldn't have believed it," I said. Afterwards he was always harmonious. There never lived a truer man.'

Finding that his inclination as a clergyman lay rather towards preaching than towards parish-work, he was directly able to gratify his instinct. He rapidly became famous as a preacher. His congregation, including many distinguished men and women, quickened to his own intellectual and spiritual vigour. For the rest of his life the announcement that he was to be in the pulpit was enough to pack any church in the country to the doors; and his later preaching tours were almost like the triumphal progresses of a successful and popular Cabinet Minister. 'Your house is one where I am always happy,' wrote Burne-Jones to him, 'and where I never know a dull moment'; and among his closer acquaintances were many writers and artists, in whose company he was always most at home. He had the means charmingly to indulge his generosity as a host, and to fill the house to which his friends were so often bidden with the treasures of art and craftsmanship that it delighted him to possess. His family life preserved for all its members both affectionate intimacy and individual freedom with rare balance; and his days were singularly free of the accidental troubles that fall to so many men to double the inevitable burden of natural griefs.

In his chosen calling any preferment seemed open to him, unless it should be closed by the liberal doctrinal views that finally led to a denial of dogma and caused his secession from the Church of England at the age of forty-eight. This secession was the only incalculable event of his life that had in it the elements of suffering; and even here he was spared the more distressing consequences of his action. To come to a spiritual decision must be in itself, in spite even of the most tormenting period of doubt that may precede it, an exhilarating thing. But it is often accompanied by the very real pain of broken personal friendships. In Brooke's case the

step was taken at last with no misgiving; and, although his parents and brothers and sisters disapproved of his decision—in his father's case, desperately so—there was no loosening of family ties, while from many of his most cherished friends he met with nothing but approval for what they looked upon as an act of self-deliverance.

His secession was a brave thing spiritually, and by it he sacrificed a good deal of orthodox credit and profit. He was Queen's Chaplain, and, had he served expediency, might have attained high place. But it was not an act of lonely defiance, not a going-out into the wilderness. In the Church history of the time it was a fine individual gesture, and a by no means insignificant if not widely-followed example. Nevertheless, it was no landmark in the progress of religious thought, since it meant no more than that Brooke, whose nature was really unfitted from the first for the formal subscriptions of any church, threw aside the shackles of dogmatic control a little later in life than might have been expected, and moved, without any radical change, into the free spiritual state which had always been his true vocation. The incident, in fact, though it necessarily assumes an important place in Brooke's biography, and although it created something of a sensation at the time, is of accidental significance only in his career. In all essential respects Brooke was the same spiritual entity after his secession as he had been before; and the man of eighty had grown without a moment of convulsive change from the man of twenty-five.

Here, then, was a career extraordinarily harmonious in its development—complete, prosperous, and happy. And yet there is, up to this point of our contact with it, nothing to set it above many that adorn each generation without making good their claim to commemoration on anything like the scale of these volumes. Nor are we much nearer a solution of the problem even when we consider Brooke's pioneer quality, when we remember that such a thought as that social evil and misery 'are not the judgments of God on the sins of the sufferers, who are undeserving of such chastisement; they are due to the neglect, ignorance, selfishness and injustice of man,' though familiar enough now, needed a prophet's voice to enforce it in 1850, and that his blow for a more

humane and intelligible form of religion came with the greater force from being struck, in Mr Jacks' words, at 'a time of great religious excitement not only among the clergy, but among the public at large.' Nor, again, does so courageous a venture as the delivery of a course of lectures on the poets as sermons from the pulpit, which must have seriously astonished a congregation of 1870, mean more than the introduction of an intellectual quality, not necessarily rare in itself, into a place where it was not at all expected. All these things are evidence of fine gifts finely used, but, if we did not go beyond these, the rarer touch of distinction would escape us.

It will be noticed that nothing has yet been said of Brooke's work as poet and critic; and it may be suggested that in that work his real eminence is to be found. It was, as we shall see, very far from being unimportant; indeed, in some respects, it was of rare accomplishment. But Brooke himself always looked upon it as something not making the chief claim on his faculties; and these are terms upon which no writer, however richly endowed, can achieve work of the highest rank. The best writers, it is true, have sometimes been compelled by circumstance to devote precious energy to work other than their writing, but it has always been with resentment and the desire for escape to undivided service of their art. But Brooke looked upon writing as an incident in a life that was for the most part otherwise concerned. When he turned to it, he brought to the task all the fertility with which he lived, and he perceived literature in the same generous and tender and genial way that he perceived life. His verse is graceful and fervent, expressive of an abundant humanity and delight in the world, but it lacks the touch of imaginative concentration that transforms these into the durable stuff of poetry. He himself, with his deep intellectual integrity, was aware of this.

'If I were not to get rid of my thoughts and excitements sometimes on paper and to one who will sympathise with them,' he says, 'I should be overwhelmed with them. I used to practise them (*sic*), but I have given up poetry. I did not write well enough to please myself, nor anyone else, so I concluded one phase of my life.' And again, 'I don't think

I am capable of writing any book on the drama of human life, save what I say in sermons. I have no invention.'

In his critical studies of poetry, of which more will be said, he went far beyond this in achievement; but even in these his aim is not so much to explore profound and universally significant principles of the poet's mind and art, as to discover for himself, through the most delightful of channels, some further expression of his vivid appreciation of the world in which he lived. Of his book on Browning he writes: 'You only . . . have recognised how much there is of myself in the book; and its interest to me is there, and less in that which I have said about Browning.' It may be true, in a sense, that all good criticism reveals the writer as much as it does his subject, but there is a special meaning in the claim that Brooke makes for his own work. It indicates a governing temper, the consideration of which should bring us near to the solution of our problem.

It is not as a representative poet or man of letters that Brooke has engaged, and justly engaged, the attention of his biographer on this large scale. Nor is it as a representative churchman or preacher or leader of religious thought. It was of these activities that his daily work was made up, it is true; and yet, while they contribute to the impression that we receive from Mr Jacks' volumes, they by no means dominate it. Nor is it, finally, wholly a question of character. The robust, affectionate, wise and often sparkling personality that comes before us is, indeed, striking and finely worthy of homage. Of such are the salt of the earth, and we are grateful to Mr Jacks for enabling us to share in no small measure a companionship that must have been so precious and delightful to Brooke's family and friends. But these admirable characteristics are not in any very rare way remarkable, and in themselves do not account for the deeper interest that we find the book successfully holding throughout its considerable length. It is, rather, that there was always in Brooke a really first-rate power of intuition that in itself may be said to have amounted to genius, though it was but fitful in its exercise. This power never wholly came into its own.

There were in the habitual operation of Brooke's temperament two principal qualities—his uncompromising common sense, and his instant responsiveness to everything and everybody with whom he came into contact, or, to use the word he himself would have chosen, his love. To a first analysis these two qualities can seem to be nothing but 'well and fair,' and yet the whole truth is by no means so easily set down. Common sense, the gift of being able in nine cases out of ten to answer yes or no to a question, and swiftly to disentangle sophistry from truth in dealing with the problems of daily affairs, is a valuable part of character; and few if any of even the most visionary of great minds have been wholly without it on occasion. But there is always the chance, the danger perhaps, that it will breed a habit of saying yes or no when in truth neither is possible, and of confusing sophistry with honest subtlety. With no man is this more likely to happen than one whose mind, endowed with great natural force and activity, moves freely in the bustle of the world's business. Such a one is at once invested with an authority which he will almost certainly find himself often forced to maintain at the sacrifice of careful and exact deliberation. There are times when his very responsibility makes impossible that loneliness to which the mind must always be able to move if it is to achieve memorable judgment. And in the same way the unquestioning response of a man's spirit to every demand that the world makes upon it, nobly generous in intention as it is, may end by impairing in some measure his realisation of himself. The one thing that is often lacking in what passes for common sense is sense; and it is not the least of love's mysteries that until a man truly and proudly loves himself he cannot love the world.

The profounder side of Brooke's nature, the genius in him, was never in doubt about these things. Against the evidence of so long and fruitful a life it may seem temerity to question Mr Jacks' conclusion that Brooke's career was rightly chosen and directed; but it is of real psychological interest to explain, if it may be done, how it came about that a man with so much of the finest quality in him left so little of the finest achievement for the quickening of posterity. And we seem to divine, as

we read the record of his life, that the genius that was always in the background prompting him to a rarer imaginative mood, was in lifelong conflict with a hardy instinct for a rough and ready intellectual state, where rapid decisions had to be made and immediate answers given in the busy atmosphere of affairs. This is not to say that the poet (and Brooke was potentially a poet of rare divination) should be remote from affairs; it is merely to say that he cannot complete himself if he is intellectually bound to affairs by circumstance.

This instinct of Brooke's was a circumstance beyond control as much as any other; and in that respect Mr Jacks is right in saying that it is useless to discuss it. But the phenomenon before us is not a common one. Brooke's intuitive power, of which examples will be given, was of a very rare order, and throughout his life it was never wholly quiescent. For its complete realisation it needed a condition of intellectual quietness and deliberation that was impossible to a popular preacher and worldly counsellor patiently accessible to every enquirer who came along. Brooke often refers to this need of his imagination in his letters and diaries; and, with the faculty itself as powerful as it was, there was the strongest probability that it would assert itself to the point of gaining his undivided allegiance. But it did not do so; and the more obvious and work-a-day though amiable quality in his mind that so successfully disputed precedence with the rarer strain must clearly have been of altogether unusual force. We have, therefore, the curious spectacle of a man who, seeking devotedly to serve the whole world, nourished one side of his nature at the expense of another side that was, in truth, potentially his finest instrument for the very service that he so earnestly sought to do.

Of Stopford Brooke's chivalrous generosity and his indulgence of every trespasser upon his attention, I had a small but very treasurable experience. When I was floundering without any kind of guidance in the difficulties of commencing author, I sent to him, in the way of bewildered novices, a small book of the greenest immaturity. Thereafter he met every approach with the most charming patience and geniality, writing no perfunctory notes, but long and considered letters that

seemed, with perfect gravity, to say that at last he had found a congenial occupation in life. Soon I was bidden to Manchester Square, and, climbing many flights of stairs to the study in the roof, I made my first trembling appearance before authority. The room was stacked with treasures, but my whole attention was absorbed at once by this man of heroic stature and bearing, who smoked cheroots in unbroken succession and made me feel in ten minutes that he considered my visit to be a very important occasion indeed. Tennyson, it appeared, had sat in that chair, Browning too, I believe; many good poets had begun by writing badly, and a failure was much excused if it was 'well tried'; beyond that there was one poem that he liked, and nothing was said of the twenty that nobody could possibly like. Everything that is good in nature flourishes under such a touch. His letters, when he was about eighty, to a junior clerk with a perplexed turn for literature, have the note of youth addressing youth. The homage that was so eagerly paid and so charmingly taken was never by the smallest hint claimed as a right. It is difficult to quote from letters that are so unwarrantably kind, lest admiration for their generosity should be mistaken for belief in their justice, but a phrase or two may be given without danger of this. '*I like it, but then I am of the 19th century, and do not mind being delayed and quietly brought to the point.*' How salutary that is in its implication, but how gentle and considerate! Then this, of an editorial introduction that I had written, '*You rate him as a poet somewhat higher than I should feel inclined to rate him—but how natural that is to an editor! and it does good rather than harm to have it done.*' These are words slight in occasion, but they are characteristic. Here was a very precious fragrance of spirit; and, in leaving us conscious of that above everything, Mr Jacks has fulfilled his subtlest obligation.

It was just this extraordinary and all-pervading instinct of sympathy—and that not only emotional but intellectual, the far rarer sort—which perpetually distracted him, so long as he lived in the great world, and hindered, as I have said, the free exercise of other powers. To cavil, even with the deepest reverence, at so fine an achievement as Brooke's life was in itself, may seem a

poor thing to do; and yet the plain truth is that, in coming to it, he left unfulfilled what might have been a yet greater service. He preached and counselled and inspired and consoled well, bestowing radiance and fragrance upon all with whom he came in contact. This was good, but it is not the whole story; and, if it had been, while there would have been splendid justification of his life, there would have been but little for so ample a record of it. For many people may and do achieve these things nobly in every generation, but to very few is given that intuitive power of which we have spoken, a power making for the most inspiring revelation in all its exercise. It must be repeated that in Brooke this power was of no minor, but of an extremely rare quality. There are men who come, with credit and even distinction, to the consummation of a gift that is essentially not of the highest kind; but Brooke's latent gift was of altogether finer stuff. 'She dwelt in the doing of right and *made it*,' he said of his mother; and the saying asserts itself as the word of genius. Here is a picture, taken from his diary, conceived beyond any necessity of the moment, to the maker of which very little, short of the greatest creative felicity, was impossible:

'John Pounds was an interesting creature—a man who, lamed for life, took up shoe-mending in a little shop, open to the air in a bye-street of Portsmouth. He made a shoe for his lame foot, and then he thought he would make his living by mending for the poor. And then, being full of affection for children, he took a wild little boy, and while he cooked taught him to read and spell. He soon had a class of 20 or 30 in his shop, and fed them with potatoes cooked in his little stove, and in this way, during his life, he taught hundreds for love. He was the real founder of the Ragged School movement. Blessley bought the shop, and kept it as it was. I visited it with great interest and pleasure. The Unitarians are very proud of him. His tomb is in the churchyard of their chapel. "May I die," he said, "as a bird dies" (he kept a number of them and a cat and rabbits) "when he drops off his perch." And so he did. He fainted one day in the Town Hall, and died on the spot. He never took money. All he did was for Love's sake; and he always worked while he taught. He seems to me the nearest of all I have known to the heart of the Kingdom of God.'

The judicious will see at once what a faculty was here to be cultivated. And this, again, in the middle of a sympathetic reference to Kingsley:

'K. screams often when he ought to speak. All his books scream. If he tells you it is five o'clock, it seems as if it were the last hour of the world. . . .'

And this of Charlotte Brontë:

'The vulgarity is not in Charlotte herself, but in the fact that she is drawing characters in a society which, as she had no experience of it, she is forced to invent out of her prejudices. . . .'

And, finally, of Mr Shaw's 'Man and Superman':

'Ann's character is the best thing in it, and is admirably done. I know those soft cats, who purr you out of existence.'

It is useless to argue that these things are no more than the captivating but slight *dicta* of a man of affairs who could at his leisure turn a happy phrase. Whatever they may be in substance, in their evidence of a very rare kind of faculty they are anything but slight. They spring from a source that, had it been allowed to run freely, could not but have risen to a stream of no common depth and force. We cannot read such things as these without reflecting, a little jealously, that Brooke devoted to the improvement of a congregation what was meant to enlighten mankind. When we turn from these strangely personal intuitive flashes to his observations made in response to the daily pressure of society and his followers our regret is emphasised. Already when he is twenty-five he writes as mentor to a sister, and, instructing her about the art of painting, says, 'It is a grand office, that of the artist, to be the orator of Nature, the exponent in form of the loveliness of colour'—than which anything shallower and more inept could not well be conceived.

This too ready surrender of himself to the transcendentalism of service, to the idea, slightly enervating to the imagination, of a continual outpouring of pervasive love, led him, moreover, at times into the most sentimental indulgence of the pathetic fallacy; for example:

'The little river ran swiftly among its boulders, and the thin grove of trees hung over it, dropping now and then a leaf loosened by the wind into it, just like a message of kindness'; and, 'The wind is the free Bohemian of the Universe, who goes over all the earth, and from north and south, east and west, from tropic to pole and from pole to tropic, it brings to the trees all the news of all the continents and isles of ocean, and of all the life of men and beasts.'

Or it could bring him to an intellectual confusion that is hardly credible in a mind capable of such insight as is shown in the passages that have been quoted :

'I love the talk of a stream more than any poetry, and the mists on a mountain shoulder more than any picture, and the sound of the wind in the forest more than a sonata of Beethoven, and the building of a mountain like Snowdon more than any cathedral in the world.'

We can hardly believe our eyes as we read, so far does the drawing of such comparisons fall short of the very alphabet of æsthetic perception. Brooke himself, it goes without saying, when the genius in him was in authority, was as alive as any one to the defective imagination implied in this manner of thinking. He could then play with such ideas graciously enough, but that was a very different thing from being mastered by them as he was at those other times. 'I like to sleep with the sound of the ocean in my ears, and to think that the waters whose gentle noise I listen to have come across 3000 miles to visit me with their affection. Their affection is given to them by me, but why not?' And let us add one other word in illustration of the profound and simple understanding that he had when his genius and not the hungry world controlled him: 'Tennyson says nothing to you. He speaks to me, not as a prophet, or a consoler, or a thinker. He speaks to me because he was a poet.'

It is for the recurrent glimpses that it gives us of the quality that lay behind so right an utterance as that and so vivid a conception as the one of old John Pounds in his shop that Mr Jacks' book is chiefly suggestive and inspiring. But it has a further value. That the quality was never brought to full fruition is a fact which we may lament, but its conflict with the forthright and vigorous

instinct for direct ministration by which it was subdued is strikingly implicit in Mr Jacks' presentation, and it has its own special significance.

One of the results of this condition that so largely governed Brooke's nature is that his old age impresses the observer, with the whole record before him, as the period of his life when he most deeply realised himself. We do not see it as a period of quietness and retrospection closing a long and crowded career, but rather as one of escape from the ties of circumstance and the more tyrannous side of himself into the full and delighted possession of the richer and rarer strain of his personality. He gave up Bedford Chapel when he was sixty-two, a few months after the publication of his 'Tennyson.' He lived twenty-two years longer, and during that time wrote and published a book on Browning, two on Shakespeare's plays, and two of miscellaneous essays on poetry. In these he never quite disentangled himself from the duality of disposition that it has been the chief purpose of this study to analyse; but his life, from the time that he cut himself clear from the formal obligations of his ministry, attained a singular lucidity and completeness. Those chapters of Mr Jacks' book that deal with this period present a figure of remarkable spiritual and intellectual beauty. The diaries and letters of these later years are pervaded by a sense of delighted liberation, none the less profound because Brooke himself probably was not externally aware of it. In passing out of the sphere in which he had laboured so nobly to realise his ideal of service, he found for the first time the condition in which his highest and subtlest instinct, the instinct for mere nobility of being, could come to perfect flowering. Mr Jacks calls the period a renewal of youth; but there is, truly, nothing in Brooke's youth or middle life comparable with the serene greatness of his old age. When the last analysis is made, that old age is, perhaps, the clearest symbol of his supreme achievement, his most durable and excellent claim to remembrance and celebration.

'I used to see a great deal of the world, a host of folk, but I got tired, and other things that I went through isolated me, and now I find the social roads very dusty and wearying. I always desire the wild moors, and solitude is my meat and

drink. There is a pompous, high-pitched sentence for you. Only, I am never morose, and life amuses me.'

'It is well-fitted to impel and kindle youth.' So wrote Brooke of Emerson's Essays; and the remark was made in admiring homage. No commendation can be more fitly made of Brooke's own critical work. It is praise that might easily be misunderstood in view of the kind of thing that is not uncommonly supposed to be suitable for this purpose, but, rightly considered, it implies no easy distinction. The young mind, in its first delighted and uncertain consciousness of the life of poetry, could have no better fortune than to come under the influence of Brooke's essays. It would suffer there nothing of the indignity that is nearly always done by age to youth in the name of instruction; it would find an unblemished eagerness to match its own, it would come continually upon profound yet simple generalisations to help it in the exercise of its judgment, and it would profit incalculably by having before it a rare example of humility. This last quality lies very sweetly at the roots of all Brooke's critical thought. It is 'so beautiful a poem,' he writes of 'Maud,'

'that the small regrets of criticism are as nothing in comparison with the large delights its poetry gives. Moreover, the criticisms may be all wrong. When we approach a great poet's work, our proper position is humility.' And, again, 'It is not by saying that one poet is better than another that we shall win a good delight for ourselves. It is by loving each of them for his proper work, and by our gratitude to them all.'

It is not necessary to attempt any detailed survey of what is a very considerable body of work, work that has, within its easily definable limitations, a durable distinction. Throughout the essays are scattered passages that could have been achieved by none but a critical mind of a very high order, a mind half directed by genius, as we have seen. Here are two examples taken indifferently from among scores. He asks what kind of poems will be written (by a poet whose instincts are sound in the matter) at a time of national crisis.

'They will not be directly written on the special national

excitements. The poet is kindled by these excitements, but he does not write on them. The stirring in his heart which he receives from the nation he applies to his own subjects, those which are personal to him.'

And this is what he says of Meredith—

'It is easy to be obscure, but there is a certain difficulty in being as obscure as Meredith was; and he liked that difficulty, and kept it with him, as a king keeps a jester.'

His style, too, often touches a most felicitous precision. 'Their manner,' he says of Milton's prose works, 'is always victorious; an audacity and a defiant life fill their controversy.' The limitations that keep his critical work as a whole from the first rank which, by the evidence of its finest moments, it might have taken, are imposed by that same defect of concentrative power that has already been examined. Just as in life he responded, too readily for serene spiritual self-realisation, to the multifarious claims of the world, so he was often so eager to explore every mood in the poet he was studying and to pour out his sympathy upon every turn in his poet's deliberation, that he left the hard way of close and exact analysis of the particular in relation to general principles and strayed into the diffuseness of unprofitable paraphrase. Both in his character and in his writing he suffered, it would seem, more than any man of his measure whose life has been recorded, from the defects of his qualities. But the qualities were of the very finest texture, and, had they been as little disturbed by conflicting elements as by every chance of nature they ought to have been, he would not only have been the memorable and distinguished figure that he is, he would have been one of the greatest men of his age.

JOHN DRINKWATER.

Art. 14.—THE GRIEVANCES AND AIMS OF LABOUR. ✓

IN 1910 the late Hubert Bland was writing newspaper articles under the heading 'The Labour Sphinx.' In 1914 members of a Borough Council were brought before a magistrate 'for telling the People that in time of war they were told they were good boys, and sent out to fight, while in time of peace they were locked out for twenty-seven weeks.' To-day we are constantly hearing such questions as :

1. 'What are the grievances and aims of Labour?'
2. 'What are the views of Labour on excess profits, profiteering and food shortage?'
3. 'Why does Labour distrust not merely the Government but also its own leaders?'
4. 'What influence have Syndicalism, Socialism and Pacifism on the mental attitude and activities of Labour?'
5. 'What is Labour's attitude on the War? What influence is being exercised by the Shop Stewards?'
6. 'What is the explanation of the general tendency to break away from Trade Unionism?'

Labour has never been understood by its rulers. To-day, though certain of its members have at least a voice in the government of the country, it is less understood than ever it was. Much redundant mental energy and pounds of good printers' ink have been spent over discussion of the psychology of the child mind; little or no serious effort has been made to comprehend working-class mentality. Deep down even in the best minds among us there exists a tendency to regard the term 'misfortune' as synonymous with 'inferiority.' Here it is of the utmost importance that there should be no failure, on the part of either the unfortunate or the fortunate, to comprehend the position. An ideal Government would understand every section of the governed, and would permit itself to be in some sort dominated by unalterable world-conditions, this submission arising out of its own wide knowledge. The more nearly our rulers approach a state of omniscience, the better will they govern, provided they be honest. Yet, if questions similar to those set forth above are actually being discussed, it seems to be clear that our Government

does not understand the working classes. Nor is it easy to see where, in past times, whole-hearted effort has been made to arrive at any such understanding. On the contrary, we find that Government after Government has encouraged the Capitalist Press in its continued policy of deceiving the general public with libels concerning Labour, while suppressing Labour's reasoned answers to such libels.

Every section of the community has its grievances, its aims and its opinions. So deep and real are the grievances of Labour that it is not remarkable to find its ambitions too exalted. Yet, so sound is the common-sense of Labour that, given correct premises, its opinions are trustworthy. Unfortunately, the reading public is given very little opportunity of realising how grossly it has been deceived by the Press in these matters. The demagogue whose avowed object it was to anger the crowd never accomplished that end with the thoroughness constantly achieved by our daily papers. Should there be a revolution within the next ten years, it is safe to predict that it will be brought about by the Capitalist Press.

Let us take the above-mentioned questions in order.

1. What are the chief grievances of Labour? Four of preeminent importance may be considered here: the working hours are too long, the pay is too low, the education provided is defective, and there is generally complete failure on the part of more fortunate persons to realise that working men and women are human.

In normal times the hours are long because the pay is low. A week's holiday in adult life is a fiscal impossibility for the very great majority. Evenings, Saturday afternoons and Sundays are, more often than not, spent in some form of irregular employ that a little extra money may be earned or some expenditure avoided. The pay is so low that 'suspension' is a real punishment and charity a necessity. The extravagance of the poor is infinitesimal when compared with that of the well-to-do. In each generation a small percentage of workers manage to save enough to maintain them when past work, but almost invariably it will be found that this struggle has resulted in permanent injury to health. Labourers are forced to retire at a much earlier age than are Cabinet Ministers, Judges and others in the educated upper classes.

That the education provided is inadequate, every employer will testify and almost every Education Bill demonstrates. Such Bills deal as a rule with everything except education, and much of the education now supplied is useless to the ordinary man. With all respect to learning, it is surely a mistake to throw open the avenues leading to it to children who have no chance of following them up. Only sound elementary education should be offered to the majority for a generation or two. Before everything else, soundness and real utility should be insisted upon.

That Labour is not generally considered human is indicated by many facts—the treatment of domestic servants and artisans as though they were unbreakable automata, the contempt felt and sometimes shown to that vast army whose members labour among dirt that the rest of the community may be clean, and so on. Nor, in this connexion, must we forget some of the after-war suggestions which have been put forward and welcomed in higher circles, notably those relating to the widespread introduction of Mass Production, which, if adopted, will degrade human beings to the condition of attachments to automatic machines, attachments more cheaply replaced than parts composed of iron or steel.

What, then, are the aims of Labour? They are essentially human; sometimes mean and paltry, generally a little selfish, occasionally noble. What, in fact, are the aims of the average man in any class? To better his lot in life, to provide adequately for his natural dependants, and to strive that the lot of his children shall be as happy as circumstances will allow; these, too, are the aims of Labour. But there the similarity ceases. Labour can show a greater justification since its claims meet with less recognition. Law and custom combine to provide the majority with less fresh air, less open sky, less leisure, and nothing to look forward to in life. It is true that there are those among them whose only aim in life is drink, and whose main achievement it is to bring misery on the few and undeserved opprobrium on the many. With this small minority the Law should deal.

Even so brief a consideration of the aims of Labour cannot be completed without reference to the methods adopted in the attempt to further those aims. Great

effort and sacrifice have been made to return Labour Members to Parliament, and there is every indication that these efforts will be redoubled in the near future. One may doubt the wisdom of this course, if only for the reason suggested above—that Government is by no means a natural function of the least well educated. Moreover, something at least should be learnt from past events. Labour Members have been openly accused of 'aping Dukes,' 'Voting in support of the Government and against their own amendments,' 'Being flattered by other Party Leaders,' 'Dining and wining with Capitalists,' 'Touring the world while the unemployed starve at home,' and so forth. Supposing that in future they do none of these things, and that their Parliamentary utterances are always sound and loyal to their constituents, still the Capitalist Press may be relied upon to curtail, even to distort, their speeches. Surely a wiser course and a simpler would be for Labour to insist on being neither libelled nor completely smothered by the Press. Many years must elapse before Labour will accomplish much without a solid backing of public opinion.

2. Working-class views on excess profits and profiteering may be said to concern themselves chiefly with matters relating to increased prices of food and fuel, together with strong opinions as to the method which should be adopted when dealing with profiteers—method, because the general opinion is that such offenders should be charged with nothing but assisting the enemy. Labour's impatience with the Government in this matter is not difficult to understand when one looks back upon certain occurrences in their chronological sequence. For example, in January 1915 there was evidence before the country of wheat-cornering and of excessive freight charges. In February of that year the quartern loaf was retailed at a price fifty per cent. above the pre-war figure. Some three weeks later the London County Council set an enquiry on foot as to the possibility of compelling retailers of bread to deliver full weight. On the question of inflated freight charges, though responsible persons have more than once assured the Government that such statements were without foundation, yet it is noteworthy that in January 1915 a Gas Company was called upon to pay 13s. 6d. per ton for coal freight,

though one ship-owner was satisfied on a basis of 5s. per ton for similar service. Three months later, April 1915, we find the same Gas Company employing its own colliers. The fact seems to be that at the outbreak of war, and for some months after, ship-owners were permitted, without interference, to reap a wonderful harvest. There was no Government control until the owners had demonstrated the flabbiness of their patriotism. Free competition among them meant the neglect of essential commodities in order to earn the higher rates offered for the carrying of other goods.\*

Unfortunately the ship-owners were by no means the only offenders. When London freights fell from 15s. 6d. to 8s. per ton, in March 1915, the cost of coal to the consumer underwent no reduction; and at the end of May Mr Runciman was still carrying on negotiations with coal-owners that pit-head prices might be fixed. Later we find another Gas Company raising the price of gas and running its own boats. In August 1915 the Chairman of one Coal Company denied 'that there had been any increase of profit owing to the war, while the Company was suffering very badly from the want of men.' Yet there was a profit of more than 40,000l. on the year's working—the first credit balance on the profit and loss account since the Company had commenced operations. In July 1916 a barge purchased for 5l. was being let on hire for 30s. a day.

In June 1917 one of the Gas Companies referred to as owning its own boats issued an illuminating circular to the Press and its customers. The following extracts are noteworthy as showing what Labour knows and is compelled to think:

'The price of gas to ordinary consumers will be raised to 3s. 1d. per thousand cubic feet, and *in the same proportion* to the consumers by slot-meters.' . . . 'Freightage during the past twelve months has risen enormously, the present *market rate* being 20s. per ton as compared with 3s. in the year 1914.' . . . 'Under the sliding scale the shareholders' dividend will be automatically *reduced*, while the employees' copartnership bonus will, for the time being, *disappear*.' (Italics are ours.)

---

\* 'Westminster Gazette,' Feb. 5, 1918.

When this circular was issued, slot-meter consumers were already paying 3s. 5d. (less a rebate of something under one penny per thousand), so that the increase now demanded was greater in their case. In December 1917 the price was again raised, the announcement being made as before:—‘For slot-meter consumers in proportion.’ In this circular also freight charges were mentioned as being in part the cause of the unpleasant necessity. A fraction over 3s. 9d. is regarded as the pre-payment equivalent of the quarterly 3s. 1d., therefore the second increase brought the credit price almost up to that which Labour had been paying since the previous June. And the price to Labour was again increased in proportion.\*

The question of Labour’s attitude towards profiteering is one which clearly has another side. To what extent has Labour been guilty of demanding excess profit? The case against the workers will be familiar to all readers. Briefly, they have been accused of earning twenty pounds a week and of wallowing in luxury owing to the war. Their reasoned answers to such charges are seldom or never given publicity. In the summer of 1916 the Chairman of a munitions committee was told that certain men were earning 20l. per week. This evidence being doubted, it was stated in corroboration that ‘Quite ordinary men were earning four and five pounds per week.’ Therefore it would appear that the twenty-pound-a-week man was four times as good as the best of the ordinary. At that time five pounds was the pre-war equivalent of fifty-five shillings. Moreover, abnormally long hours were being worked, so that more and better food was an imperative necessity, while the workman’s home employment had perforce to be abandoned. In discussing working-class earnings there is one peculiar consideration often overlooked by persons of education. In normal times the workman labours, as a rule, for something either a little above or a little below a living wage, and wears himself out all the time. He can set aside nothing for physical depreciation, much less show a profit. The community’s excuse for this has always been the same:—‘Economic laws are inexorable.

\* There is no desire to make invidious selection. Unless some definite instances be adduced, the charge of ‘vague generalisation’ may be incurred,

The supply exceeds the demand, hence the low rate of pay.' If for a period the conditions are reversed, and the demand exceeds the supply, must the converse of that law be set aside lest perchance Labour should profit even for a relatively short period?

Food shortage, as distinct from food costliness, has had many unfortunate effects of which by no means all have yet come to the surface. Class hatred has been to some extent exacerbated, and Labour contends that, as a consequence of the negligence of successive Governments in spite of reiterated warnings, we have no national storehouses, and that very little wisdom has been shown in the selection of food controllers. Concerning these officials, it is contended that they were drawn from the wrong class, and that, if they were vested with sufficient powers, they have been careful not to exercise those powers. Proof of this argument is found in the fact that important articles to which they affixed a price have promptly disappeared from the market. Tea, margarine, meat and rabbits are all commodities which have passed through these stages. For the sake of brief demonstration it may be well to consider only the case of the elusive rabbit. It has been estimated that for a period of ten weeks immediately preceding the fixing of the price, 80,000 rabbits were offered weekly for sale on the London markets. In the eleventh week, ending Jan. 19, 1918, only 500 were available. And the apologists were quick to prove too much. 'Rabbits,' cried one section, 'must not be killed just now; they are tending their young.' 'Weather conditions' was the explanation offered by another section; 'frost and snow have made it difficult to get rabbits.' As though this were not enough, we had other plausible persons urging that all the conies were drowned in their holes by the recent rains, while it was impossible to shoot them, since sporting cartridges were unobtainable.

At the close of 1917 and the beginning of 1918, when the poor had learned by bitter experience that their only hope of obtaining any share of certain foodstuffs lay in patient waiting hour after hour in a queue, it was unfortunate that certain journalists and others should have deemed it in good taste to sneer at the enforced procedure. Presumably these ill-timed efforts at humour

were the work of national importance undertaken by persons not themselves affected by the grave discomfort. As one result, authentic stories (which had been well-nigh forgotten) of motor-cars used by their owners at the commencement of the war for the collection of food-stuffs in bulk were revived and given a stamp of permanency which they would not otherwise have obtained. It may be of interest to note here that Labour saw and came very near to adopting a drastic course which would have hastened the movements of authority toward a solution of the difficulty. It would have been a simple matter for the men to abandon their work in favour of standing on the kerb, thus relieving their women-folk of that unpleasant necessity.

Considering the question of food shortage generally, it should not be forgotten that better conditions of employment have raised thousands of families from a position just below the hunger line to a point above it, while in other cases increased muscular output each day has demanded an increase of food. Hence much of the enhanced consumption among the working classes is perfectly reasonable. It is at least depressing to find charges of extravagance constantly made by persons who have been accustomed to their share of this world's goods throughout their entire lives. Is it the rich or the poor man who consumes most of the earth's produce, and for whom most human energy is expended? What constitutes extravagance?

3. As to the question, Why does Labour distrust not merely the Government, but also its own leaders? Here, again, we must remember that Labour is human. Why do human beings distrust one another? Always as the result of either ignorance or experience, or both. Labour distrusts the Government both because of experience and because of ignorance; it distrusts its own leaders as the result, mainly, of experience. And in each case the distrust is something more serious than mere want of confidence. It is that most unpleasant of all doubts which casts serious reflexions on the honesty of the distrusted.

For the ignorance which leads Labour to distrust the Government successive Governments are to blame. This ignorance is of two kinds, being in part congenital and

in part the result of that policy which withholds information from the public. The congenital ignorance of to-day is the fault of Governments and of educationalists two or three generations back. Since this fault is being perpetuated in its entirety by the authorities to-day, it will of course continue to act throughout two or three generations to come. Here let it be admitted that the congenital ignorance from which Labour suffers, and which no one can remove in a moment, is to some extent an excellent reason for that other ignorance which ministerial action fosters. A little knowledge of certain present occurrences would undoubtedly be bad for the suddenly informed, if only because they have not the breadth of outlook, the comprehensive mental grasp, which can only be obtained by the individual whose forbears have read abundantly and intelligently. In the ranks of Labour we find the highest living authorities on working-class matters generally. This is the knowledge which Labour would be well advised to use for its own real advancement both now and in the future. That Labour does not and cannot be expected to understand international affairs is the fault of men dead and gone. If it is reasonable to blame our ancestors for having bequeathed us nothing, then also it is reasonable for us to bestir ourselves on behalf of posterity, and try to remedy the defect.

Labour is, however, particularly well informed about one thing—and that is the treatment it has received at the hands of this and former Governments. Too many assurances, amounting almost to promises but remaining unfulfilled, will undermine the confidence of any recipients. Bitter indeed is the anger when, at a later date, persuasive oratory is more carefully examined and found to have been a mere husk. The House of Commons had its faith in orators worn out many years ago. Labour is approaching the same condition.

The individual who, having trusted another, comes ultimately to suspect him cannot be charged with ignorance. Labour distrust of Labour leaders is the result of experience. So far back as August 1913 we find the Press asking, 'Is there a Labour Party?' While there is Labour there will always be a Labour Party, though it may reasonably be hoped that, in spite of events likely

to happen in the near future, Labour may see the wisdom of devoting more attention to matters more important than the return of Members to the House of Commons. Reference has already been made to some of the accusations brought against Labour Members. Baldly, the position is this. Labour feels that, when its representatives attain a certain eminence, they are in danger of being 'bought.' This suggestion seldom or never implies actual bribery; the term is used to convey the notion of influence obtained even by ordinarily courteous address. Labour is not used to common politeness from its social superiors, and only Labour can understand how vast is the influence which may be exercised in this way. Democracy wants leaders who will remain democrats. Hence the Shop Stewards, whose origin and influence will be dealt with more fully presently. Labour has learned by bitter experience that the Leader, be he Member of Parliament or mere Trade Union official, who reaches a certain eminence is apt to soar beyond the reach of his followers. The position is bizarre; much might be written of informal workshop discussion on the questions involved. One man says, 'Wouldn't you do the same if ever you had the luck to get there?' But his mate replies, 'Ain't you tired of letting them climb on your back and give you a kick on the dome as they hop to the next stage?'

In short, on the one hand, 'Can a man remaining in the ranks lead from that position?' On the other, 'Can a leader remain in, or even in touch with, the ranks?' There lies the crux of the problem.

4. The direct influence of Syndicalist doctrine on Labour in this country is negligible. It is true that in the workshop, the mess-room and the market-place the man who suggests going the entire animal is sometimes given a hearing; but almost invariably he is regarded as a fanatic, whose claim to attention rests solely upon the fact that he can amuse the crowd who, being always human, appreciate the innocence which invites leg-pulling. Though the Universal Strike has never been seriously contemplated, yet in the years 1911-12 there were enough simultaneous strikes in this country to make it abundantly clear to the British workman that he and his would be the first and the greatest sufferers under

any such movement. The suggestion that all powers of government should be usurped by any one class makes no appeal to true democrats, while the idea that national business should be managed by the least well educated is openly scouted by the more intelligent and influential, if least noisy, working men. Our Press insists that the public generally shall derive its ideas of Labour from what ranters say to Labour audiences.

The indirect influence of Syndicalism upon Labour is a far more serious thing. We find that not only educated persons, but even the Government of the country has been misled by the Press into a dread of the comprehensive strike and the usurpation, or attempted usurpation, of power by manual labour as the next move in Labour's policy. The trouble between the Government and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (familiarily known as the 'Mals') furnishes as striking an instance as we shall find. It is openly asserted in working-class circles that, prior to the introduction of the Man Power Bill, the Government, seeking to divide the workers, had given preferential treatment to the engineers. When the engineers in opposition demanded a continuation of special treatment and lonely conferences, Authority refused because—so Labour contends—the section of workers thus bought over was now deemed too small. The position of the wedge was not found satisfactory. The separation of only two hundred thousand from the remaining million was not regarded by the official mind as a sufficiently central cleavage. This, however, is not the entire explanation of the opposition encountered by the Bill. The working classes dread the introduction of Mass Production on any extensive scale. There is a feeling that any attempt to take skilled men for the army, while dilutees are left, means a crippling of the finances of the skilled and the giving of further training to the unskilled—two important points to be gained by the employer class in the furthering of their end.

The influence of Socialism is much less than might be expected, because so many different varieties of the doctrine are constantly being offered for working-class consumption. Trades Unions in the past have shown reluctance to sink minor differences and unite on broad principles. And the cry of individual Socialists, be their

particular creed what it may, is ever the same: 'This is the true Socialism, to which others are not yet educated up.' Unions may join hands to arrive at one definite end when that end is practically within sight, but they are reluctant to enter upon an alliance which must remain in force for a term of years while a continuous policy is being followed. The supposed merits of State Control have lost much of their seeming value in the eyes of thoughtful working men. They are not satisfied with the various Education Acts or with what they know of the forthcoming Bill, the benefits of State Insurance or the Government's treatment of many war problems. From South Wales we were told, in February last, that 'The only emotion which assuages the acute and deplorable differences between employers and employees is a growing common hatred of State Control.' Upon the question in its entire breadth—Socialism or no? if one approaches a number of the quietly influential men, the replies obtained are in very close agreement and may be epitomised thus: 'All men are not equal, and never can be equal; but we have yet to learn that there are reasonable grounds for denying a sufficient share of either light, air, food or rest to any men, women or children. What form of inferiority constitutes the bar?' The agreement in thought indicated is remarkable, since the men chosen are of the class or type which neither shouts nor troubles itself over much about the exchange of ideas; the conclusions, in fact, are arrived at independently. Such men generally wield great influence, though they neither seek it nor advertise the fact.

Pacifism has passed through three distinct stages in Labour circles. There has been much misunderstanding in this connexion. Working men and women are perfectly honest in their desire for peace, 'extra money or no.' To them the pacifist is the crank who desires the wrong or useless sort of peace; and, if they discuss matters at all with such propagandists, it is merely to ask how Germany is to be bound. In the first of the three stages we saw the well-developed tendency to hound the pacifist down, but, as months grew into years, as casualty lists seemed to grow longer and longer, as the Government committed ineptitude after ineptitude, and as the Press slipped back into its dishonourable

methods with regard to Labour, there was serious talk of a 'League of Nations,' and of a bigger share for Labour in the control of matters international. Then came the Russian upheaval which, developing into Bolshevism, consolidated a certain amount of scattered opinion among the workers here, and produced the formula: 'Now that Russia has gained freedom for the People, why cannot we and Germany do the same?' Note here two significant points; the Man Power Bill did not propose to take any men from the ship-building industry, yet the ship-builders were opposing it; and, at about the same time, peace meetings, which had formerly been broken up by the people, were now being dispersed by the police. And that section of the Press which has always been most disingenuous in its dealings with Labour was at this stage much more virulent against Prussianism than were its contemporaries, and more emphatic in reiteration of the impossibility of peace until Germany should have been smashed into submission. This denunciation of Prussianism and insistence on its humiliation were no doubt justified by facts, but it is unfortunate that a group of journals whose attitude towards the workers had long been suspect should be loudest in the cry.

Fortunately, however, through all such talk, Labour hears the voices it has learned in a sub-conscious way to respect, the voices of men who seek no leadership and whose one hope it is that reason may prevail. Such men have for months past been content to ask but two questions: 'How can we make peace with a Government of baby-killing pirates?' 'How can we negotiate with a people still subject to baby-killing pirates?' It is to such influence that the third stage in Labour's attitude to pacifism is mainly due. Yet it must not be forgotten that, down to about the end of February last, Labour extremists continued to rejoice over events in Russia and to express admiration for, and faith in, Lenin, Trotsky and the rest of the Bolsheviks. While it is never safe to prophesy concerning our extremists, yet it is always comforting to reflect that they are few in number and their power is in no direct proportion to the noise they make. At least this is certain, that recent events in Russia have formed a useful lesson; and some of our hot-heads are, for the time at least, less aggressive.

5. Labour's attitude on the war is, like that of every other section of the community, a complex thing. New suspicions have come into being, dormant ones have been aroused. New vistas have been opened up, familiar ones closed. Casualty lists have been scanned in trepidation till the presence there of a familiar name has rendered further search unnecessary. Labour, in fact, is human. Yet Labour must pay for lost time though sons be maimed or deaths occur.

Of the suspicions aroused in the various types of working-class mind not much need be said. It has been urged, for example, that this War was brought about by the Government because the workers were becoming too strong; that it was engineered by newspaper men in search of copy; that coal-owners, ship-owners or munition-makers precipitated it for the sake of increased business and inflated prices; and that Capitalists generally were responsible for it in their greed for world-markets. Yet, in spite of these wild assertions, British working-class opinion was enthusiastically in favour of the war throughout the autumn of 1914, simply because Belgium needed help and our Government was pledged to defend her. At a later date mention was made of the Congo, and, still later, workers began to find fault with secret diplomacy. But, while these changes were taking place, so too were others of more direct importance to the working classes. Hundreds of men who had striven with enthusiasm to enrol in the army were not permitted to do so on the ground that they were necessary to the country in their ordinary employ. Later, all these enthusiasts were either conscribed or sneered at in the columns of our daily Press as cowardly shirkers. Much of the talk concerning patriotism, too, was ill advised. The labourer's experience is insular; from that experience he is apt to conclude that he is given the worst of things generally. Why, then, should he love the country in which he is so treated? Sense of honour and love of fair play will move him deeply when the suggestion of patriotism will leave him cold. His own knowledge does not lead him to overseas comparisons; while his well-founded distrust of the Press prevents his acceptance of much that he reads.

Many of the strikes which have occurred since the

outbreak of war are directly attributable to Government blundering. Had food prices not been permitted to soar to unwarranted heights, wages might have remained more nearly at their normal level.\* If one section of Labour is given a bonus, why should not all others get it? A loaf costs the clerk in Government employ quite as much as is paid for it by the munition worker; yet the munitioner, already in receipt of a much higher rate of pay than the clerk, receives twice the added bonus granted, as Authority is careful to state, to meet the added cost of living. Concerning the outcome of the war: to Labour it is simply unthinkable that Great Britain should be conquered, but dread of extensive Mass Production and the maintenance of high food prices is strongly marked. Concerning food prices, Labour knows that there was a huge all-round increase at the time of the Crimean War, and no commensurate drop when peace was restored. It will be found later that our working classes are determined to spare no effort in the attaining of the two ends which seem to them all important: there shall be no more war if Labour can prevent it, and the nation which has imposed the duty to fight shall grant the right to work at a living wage.

The extent and direction of the Shop Stewards' influence may be gathered from the reasons generally accepted for the creation of the office. It has been mentioned that Labour is weary of the type of leader who is apt to soar to a plane where the wishes and influence of his constituents can no longer reach him. The kind of encouragement given by Parliament and the Press to Labour leaders has largely deprived Labour of the services of those leaders. It is now demanded by the workers that their representatives and mouthpieces shall remain in closer touch with them. The one other important reason for the creation of the office of Shop Steward is of an even more painful suggestiveness. Labour has been led to conclude that the Government sometimes allows minor officials to speak as with full authority, only to repudiate these subordinates at a later

\* On Feb. 20, 1918, it was announced that the Food Controller was about to issue an order prohibiting, among other things, the holding up by importers and wholesalers of perishable foodstuffs with the object of maintaining prices. Why was this not done two years earlier?

date. Labour has now adopted such a device, principally with a view to safeguarding Trade Union funds. But Labour is not always dishonourable or unreasonable in this matter; witness the following authentic story. The workers in a shop forming part of a large factory demanded the provision of a bomb-proof dug-out; their Shop Steward laid their demand before the Manager, who met the request fairly, pointing out first that compliance was not possible in the situation, since any dug-out would immediately be flooded, and next that the request was scarcely reasonable, the shop being already splinter-proof, therefore as well protected as other shops and the average dwelling-house. The Steward, whether convinced or no, became abusive. There the matter would no doubt have been allowed to rest but for the intervention of the workers in the shop, who wrote to the Manager expressing their thanks and their regrets, dissociating themselves from the attitude of their Steward.

6. The general tendency to break away from Trade Unionism is less easy to explain. In spite of a lengthy newspaper wrangle, psychologists have not yet determined the reason which induces a child to crawl up a staircase—presumably because there is no one reason which can be deemed all-sufficing as an explanation of the phenomenon. Similarly, no general tendency or movement on the part of a large body of adults can ever be attributed to one simple cause. The vain effort to sum up the situation in very few words, and as the outcome of but one cause, invariably results in a formula needing much expansion. For example, a bald assertion that trade unionists generally are seceding from unionism because they are not satisfied with its achievements will not help us much.

Trade Unionism, as we know it to-day, is losing grip on its members because its internal policy was never sound, and because its external policy, which had perforce to be left largely in the hands of leaders, has been to a great extent abandoned by those leaders. So great is the weakness of internal policy that it might almost be asserted of this policy that it does not exist. The man whose language or behaviour is objectionable may be deemed a courageous being or a humorist by the worst type of his fellow unionists, but there are others

who know that he is doing more harm to the movement than any blacklegs could accomplish in so short a time. It is deplorable that under existing conditions such a man may be deemed a good unionist. The man who drinks to excess is unfortunately apt to be lionised by the majority of his mates, though there are others who can see no great future for the system which is satisfied merely to bundle him out of sight on the occasion of a strike parade. No Government concerning itself only with foreign policy could be deemed a good Government. Such hollowness goes far to explain restiveness among unionists, as well as the fact that the best minds among them are dissatisfied, though the imperative need of unity is not lost sight of. If Trade Unions are to continue as a power, they must insist upon a certain standard of decency among their members. The man who is deliberately offensive to total strangers is probably robbing his wife and children. He cannot reasonably claim to be on an equality with the average citizen. When men of this unpleasant type are 'called out' by their Union, they respond readily enough and may show fortitude under privation. But this should not be deemed their whole duty. The value of public opinion has been demonstrated again and again in connexion with strikes. It is for the ill-behaved to reflect that their conduct has been alienating that opinion and giving colour to the worst kind of misrepresentation in the Capitalist Press. Let Trade Unionists realise that the evil done by 'Blue noses' is at least as great as that accomplished by 'Black legs.'

Trade Unionism in the past has concentrated its efforts on external or fighting policy. There is now a tendency among leaders to abandon that policy. So bad were the manners of most masters a short time back that to-day we find a very little courtesy having a wonderful effect on the men. Small wonder that the men's leaders, suddenly in touch with their social superiors, now think, or believe they think, that the interest of Capital and Labour are not very far apart, indeed almost identical. Yet 'Capital and Labour' is often only another expression for 'Buyer and Seller.' When the Labour leader realises that capitalists are 'not such bad chaps after all,' he has made a distinct advance. But he is apt

to outrun the truth implied. Capital, like Labour, is human; each is striving to gain its own end. Competition and combativeness may be interchangeable terms. The competition between Capital and Labour means simply this, that Labour is making a determined bid to wrest from Capital something more like an adequate share of the pleasanter necessities of life, practically the whole of which are now in the hands of Capital. Other things being equal, it is probable that in any such strife the more aggressive will win. But other things are by no means equal. Capital is in possession; it has the power of the purse and the power of the Press; while on the other hand, paradox though it seem, Labour's greatest asset is its reasonable need.

It has been demonstrated in many ways that strong Trade Unions are of benefit to the entire community. Therefore it is to be hoped that the present restiveness among Trade Unionists will soon adjust itself. Remedy for the internal weakness is entirely a matter for the men; for the external troubles Government aid must be sought. The Law which grants redress to the individual who has been slandered must be so amended that sections of the community which have been maligned shall be provided with constitutional means of righting themselves in the eyes of the Public. The Public arbitrates justly on facts laid before it, but does not yet realise that, when Capital and Labour are disputing, it is only Capital which in present conditions can freely address the Court. If Labour cannot make its voice heard in the columns of the Capitalist Daily Press, its first aim should be to start and to circulate an adequate Press of its own. Such a Press will be worth more, in the long run, than many Labour Members at Westminster.

A SKILLED LABOURER.

# Art. 15.—THE COURSE OF THE WAR.

SINCE the irruption of the German armies into France, there has been no event so momentous, or so pregnant with possibilities, as Russia's desertion of the Allied cause. Its immediate results are now plainly visible in France, where, at the time of writing, our gallant troops are at death-grips with an adversary more formidable, by virtue of long experience both of offensive and defensive war, than he was in 1914. But, while its effect on the military situation is apparent at a glance, a closer consideration suggests that it may lead to consequences more permanent and far-reaching than seem, at present, to be generally supposed. It not only affects the present aspect of the war, but it appears likely to exercise a profound influence on the potential military situation after the war—in other words, on the balance of power in Europe, and throughout the world.

The immediate consequence of Russia's secession has been the reversal of the balance of forces on the western front by the transfer of a large number of hostile troops from Russia and Rumania. The German armies in France and Belgium, which, in September 1917, comprised 147 divisions, were reinforced during the winter by 35 divisions from the eastern, and 4 divisions from the Italian front. The arrival of Austrian troops in Belgium was rumoured as far back as January last; and, though it may be doubted whether the German General Staff would venture to pit Austrian divisions against French or British troops in battle, they would serve to relieve Germans in garrisons, on the lines of communication, and, perhaps, in sequestered sectors of the front. It has been remarked that the German divisions brought from Russia are of inferior quality. It is true that the pick of the troops which had taken part in last year's winter campaign had been transferred to France at the close of the operations; and that, since the disintegration of the Russian army, the eastern front has been used as a sanatorium, to which worn-out divisions were sent to recuperate, and as a training-ground for new levies. It would be a mistake, however, to depreciate the value of these reinforcements. Rest, change of scene, and the

infusion of new blood, soon restore the efficiency of war-worn units; and those not considered fit for battle would be of use to replace troops of better quality in sectors outside the battle-zone. Nor should too much be made of the reduction of the German divisional establishment from four to three regiments, this expedient not having been confined to the German army. In the exodus from Russia, guns are an item not less important than men; for there is no further use for heavy artillery on the eastern front. Moreover, the German resources have been augmented by practically the whole of the Russian artillery, as well as by a large number of guns taken from the Italians, and by a vast quantity of ammunition and other material of war, the acquisition of which will have relieved the strain on the German munition-factories, releasing labour for employment in other directions, such as the building of submarines and aeroplanes, and the repair of railways and rolling-stock.

With these advantages at their command, the Germans have seized the opportunity to strike what is evidently intended to be a decisive blow before the American armies can take the field in force. It seems to be generally supposed that this is a last desperate effort, and that, in the event of failure, their losses will be so heavy as to oblige them to acknowledge defeat. The Germans are, perhaps, equally justified in expecting that, if they should fail, the Allies will be incapacitated from taking the offensive this year; and it would be quite in accordance with their methods to draw the Americans into action in detachments, with the object of impairing their value as a complete and organised force. Hitherto they have confessedly been counting on the economic factor and the political offensive against the home fronts, rather than on force of arms, to compel the Allies to accept peace, as the Russians have done, on German terms. These influences have not fulfilled their expectations; and it is probably for this reason that they have embarked on a supreme effort to destroy the Allied Armies, which, if it should not succeed, might result in a renewal of the deadlock on the fighting front. In short, they hope either to win a decisive victory, or to bring about a period of stagnation, during which they would exploit the resources of the occupied

Russian provinces, and devote their energies to the prosecution of their economic and political campaigns.

The past three months have been a period of ceaseless activity, both on the fighting fronts and in large areas in rear of the opposing lines. Bombardments, raids, and minor attacks have been reported from every sector of the front between Nieuport and Alsace, increasing in magnitude and frequency as time went on. Battle-training was conducted on a large scale behind the German lines; and, on our side, extensive arrangements were made for meeting the expected attack by strengthening existing positions, and constructing successive lines of defence. All necessary preparations and dispositions were understood to have been completed when, on Thursday, March 21, the storm burst.

The German infantry attack, which was preceded by four hours' intense bombardment of the forward lines and back areas, extended from the neighbourhood of the Scarpe to the Oise, a front of about fifty miles. The main attack appears to have been launched between Cherisy and the Cambrai—Bapaume road, where our troops, though heavily outnumbered, made a very gallant defence, holding the enemy back on the greater part of the front, and, on the remaining portion, only falling back on the main positions. Between Hargicourt and Epehy, and in the sector between St Quentin and the Omignon, there were also retirements, which necessitated a readjustment in the adjoining sectors; but the rest of the front appears to have undergone little change on the first day. But fresh divisions were massing behind the German front, while, so far as can be judged from the reports available at the time of writing, our reserves had not come up in any appreciable numbers to reinforce the weakly-manned fighting front.

On the second day (March 22) the Germans broke through our defensive system west of St Quentin; and, by the following evening, the troops in this region had retreated to the Somme, a distance of fifteen miles, involving a corresponding withdrawal between the Somme and the Oise. The front between Hargicourt and Epehy, which had been strained on the previous day, also gave way, with the result that the 9th Division, which had maintained a solid front in the Gouzeaucourt sector,

narrowly escaped being outflanked, and the 24th Division, which had made a gallant defence about Le Verguier, was also endangered. The gap between Epehy and Gouzeaucourt was closed by reserves; but the double failure necessitated the withdrawal of the centre of our front (approximately) to the line Roisel—Doignies. On the 23rd the Germans captured Chauny, Ham, and Péronne; and, at the close of the day, our front lay, roughly, on the line Chauny—River Somme—Biaches—Sailly—Haplincourt—Sapignies. North of the last-named village the enemy had taken Henin, Wancourt, and the heights above Monchy le Preux. They claimed 30,000 prisoners, and 600 guns.

On March 24, the enemy having brought up fresh troops in great numbers, the battle raged furiously about Bapaume. Late at night the town fell to concentric attacks from the north-east, east and south-east. South of the Somme the Germans entered Guiscard and Nesle; and French troops, who had taken over the Nesle—Noyon front, were heavily engaged about the latter town. The enemy crossed the Somme at Brie, St Christ, Falvy and Voyennes. Throughout the following day violent fighting continued on the entire battle-front, in the course of which the Germans made progress both north and south of the Somme. During the night of March 25-26, which was comparatively quiet, the Allies took up new positions on the line Noyon—Roye—Albert. In the morning of the 26th the Germans resumed their attacks south of the Somme, where they had brought up several fresh divisions, and captured Roye and Chaulnes. At the end of the day the battle-front was roughly defined by the line Noyon—Beauvraignes—Rosières—Sailly le Sec—Meri-court—Albert—Puisieux—Boiry—Wancourt. The enemy were in Albert. On March 27 the Germans again attacked with great violence on the entire front, but only made slight progress about Roye, and gained a footing in Ablainzeville; while our troops, counter-attacking astride of the Somme, advanced their line to Proyart, and recaptured Chipilly and Morlancourt. During the night the Germans made their way across the river near Chipilly, intercepting our troops at Proyart, who, however, cut their way back to Hamel.

The loss of Albert, and the enemy's progress further

north, having deprived us of direct communication between Amiens and Arras, the Germans appear to have thought the opportunity favourable for an attempt against our positions in the Arras quarter. Attacking, on March 28, with seven divisions astride the Scarpe, they penetrated our advanced positions, but were stopped by the main line of defence Neuville—Fampoux—Arleux. Severe fighting continued on the rest of the front without material change, except at Montdidier, which fell into the enemy's hands, and between that place and Lassigny, where the French made some progress in a counter-offensive. On the following day there were no serious attacks north of the Somme; but the Germans, in the course of severe fighting, pressed the French back to the line Gratibus—La Neuville—Mezières, whence we prolonged the front through Demuin and Hamel. The French counter-offensive was checked. At this stage the Germans claimed to have captured 70,000 prisoners and 1,100 guns, of which 40,000 prisoners and 600 guns were taken by von Hutier's army between the Somme and the Oise.

On March 30 the Germans threw in fresh divisions between Albert and Boiry, but without gaining ground. South of the Somme, where their principal efforts were again made, they entered Demuin and Moreuil (but were expelled later) and captured Aubvillers, Cantigny, Mesnil, and Le Monchel. They also attacked furiously in the Montdidier—Lassigny sector, but without success. On the 31st their efforts appeared to slacken, their attacks being restricted to the zone between the Proyart—Amiens road and the Avre. North of the Luce they gained a footing in Hangard; and, south of Moreuil, they made some progress in the direction of Mailly. In the Montdidier—Lassigny sector the French threw them back, recapturing Le Monchel and Plemont, and advancing about Orvillers and towards Canny sur Matz. The Germans, however, claimed to have captured Mont Renaud (south-west of Noyon), and to have thrown the French back across the Divette. At the end of the day the Allied line was roughly as follows:—River Divette—Orvillers—Le Monchel—Cantigny—Grivesnes—Aubvillers—Demuin—Hangard—Marcelcave—Hamel. North of the Somme the situation was unchanged.

In the present state of public knowledge, any comment on the operations can only be of a general nature, and subject to correction when the facts become fully known. The most salient features of the German offensive are the large forces employed, the crushing superiority established in certain sectors, the rapidity of the advance in the earlier stages, and the methods by which the Germans sought, on nearly every occasion, to give their attacks a converging form by throwing the weight of their forces principally on either flank of the objective aimed at. Of 186 divisions on the Nieuport—Belfort front, 77 were in reserve; and nearly one-half of the entire force—some 90 divisions—came into action on the British battle-front. On the first day the enemy had 17 divisions to our five on the Cherisy—Boursies front, and 8 to 3 in the St Quentin sector; 40 divisions, in all, being engaged in the first attack. Later, when they had decided on their line of action, the discrepancy was even more pronounced. Their rapid progress was due to skill in executing the 'leap-frog' method of attack; each division in the fighting line, so soon as it began to flag, being promptly replaced by a fresh one which, passing through its ranks, carried on the attack till it, in turn, was similarly relieved. Thus the defence was given no respite, and there was little time to co-ordinate the action of the reserves. The general objective was, no doubt, Amiens, the capture of which, together with Abbeville, would separate the Allied Armies north and south of the Somme, and deprive them of all means of inter-communication except by sea. This accomplished, the Germans probably intended to throw their weight against the smaller group of armies north of the Somme, which would be in danger of being hemmed in against the Channel coast.

But, while this was probably the general design, the method of its execution would depend on the course of the early stage of the battle. The distribution of the forces seems to indicate the intention of throwing the wings forward in a great converging movement; but the attack of the right wing failed, while a weak spot was found between Epehy and Hargicourt, which the enemy proceeded to exploit on the second day. The situation, however, was by no means so favourable as

the Germans had hoped. The inflexible attitude of our divisions on the Cherisy—Boursies front (among which the 3rd, 40th, 51st, and 19th were specially commended) and, subsequently, the solid resistance of our line southwards to the Somme, have caused the Germans serious embarrassment by narrowing their offensive front, and causing it ultimately to assume a pronounced salient in the region of Montdidier. Had the French been able to throw more weight into their counter-offensive between Montdidier and Noyon, things might have gone badly for the enemy.

It is hardly necessary to refer to the advantage conferred on the Germans by the fine weather during the first week of their offensive. They were able to push their artillery and supplies forward with far greater freedom than we have enjoyed in any of our battles on the western front; and in the bright moonlight movements were effected as expeditiously as by day. It might, perhaps, seem that the Allies were equally favoured by these circumstances; but there was this difference, that the Germans could only move by the roads, or across country (the railways having been destroyed), while the Allies' defence depended largely on the movement of reserves from a distance by rail, which was less dependent on light and weather. Whether the Allied forces were originally distributed to the best advantage must remain an open question until all the circumstances become known. The Germans, having the initiative, could have attacked either towards Amiens or Paris, their initial dispositions lending themselves to either course; and the difficult task of so adapting the Allied dispositions as to provide for both eventualities, and of controlling the subsequent operations, devolved on the Allied War Council, as recently constituted. The appointment of General Foch as virtual Generalissimo, announced on March 30, seems to indicate that the proverbial inefficiency of such a body for the supreme direction of operations had again been demonstrated.

As events proved, the front was not held in sufficient strength, and the local reserves were inadequate to adjust the balance, the Commander-in-Chief having been left with insufficient forces at his command. It cannot, however, be said that the strategic reserves were unduly

long in coming up, when it is recalled that the Germans took ten days to prepare their counter-stroke at Cambrai in November last—an operation relatively insignificant. It was, no doubt, largely owing to the unexpected rapidity of the enemy's progress that these reserves were used in dribblets, to repair weak places, instead of coming into action as a compact force, which, had it been available in the Montdidier—Noyon sector on March 28, might have produced a decisive effect. The ability of our troops to hold the line against greatly superior numbers was doubtless overestimated. In fact, Sir Auckland Geddes voiced the general belief when, on Jan. 14, he assured the House of Commons that the Allied forces in numbers and *moral* were 'in a position to face the enemy at least on equal terms.' Since the first battle of Ypres, when our troops held out against enormous odds, we have had little experience of the defensive. In the meantime the Germans have learnt much; and the development of artillery, and various new inventions, have changed the conditions of attack and defence. Moreover, the value of the troops and artillery brought from the Russian front was evidently under-estimated.

The defection of Russia has not merely changed the balance of forces in the western theatre of operations; it has changed the whole aspect of the war. It has rid the Central Powers of the embarrassment of having to conduct the war on two fronts. It has, in fact, done, in an unforeseen manner, what the Germans set out to accomplish at the beginning. Faced by the unready millions of Russia in the East, and by the combined forces of France and Great Britain in the West, they endeavoured first to get rid of the Western allies, as a preliminary to dealing with the Russians at their leisure. The plan failed, for various reasons—the German defeat on the Marne, the unexpected rapidity of the Russian mobilisation, the collapse of the Austrian offensive in Poland, and the invasion of East Prussia by Rennenkampf's army. The situation was well-nigh desperate; but it was saved by another unforeseen development—the practical impregnability of scientifically designed entrenchments, supported by heavy artillery and machine-guns. Curiously enough, the 'war of positions' which

resulted benefited both sides. It gave the Germans time to push the Russians back to a safe distance from the frontier, to enlist the Bulgarians on their side, and, by conquering Serbia and relieving the Turks, to further their policy of dominating the Balkans and opening the way to the East. But it enabled us to prepare new armies, and gave Italy time to complete the organisation and equipment of her forces, with the result that, for the moment, the danger-point was transferred from the East to the West.

From that time, until Russia committed military suicide, Germany had to suffer the embarrassment of a war on two fronts. Her forces being insufficient to make headway on both simultaneously, she had to defend herself against superior forces on one, while taking the offensive on the other; and, during part of the time, she was subjected to simultaneous attacks on both fronts. Those who enlarged on the advantages of Germany's central position saw only one side of the situation. It is true that, if all the forces acting against her had been arrayed on one front, or if they had had free intercommunication for reinforcements and supplies, her position would have been desperate; indeed, she would not have thought of going to war. But, taking the situation as it was, she could only hope to win the war by eliminating one front, while averting defeat on the other. A year ago every prospect of accomplishing this by force of arms had vanished, for the Allies were stronger on both fronts than they had ever been before.

Russia having eliminated herself, Germany's object now is to ensure her military impotence for all time. Elusive though the Germans have been on the subject of peace proposals, they have made no secret of their military policy in the East. An open road to the Persian Gulf, and a secure frontier against Russia, were the minimum they set out to attain. The German Press dilated on the latter subject during the invasion of Russia in 1915, and, with other agencies, endeavoured to enlighten public opinion concerning the requirements of the case. A 'frontier belt' was to be drawn from the Gulf of Finland to Galicia; Poland and the Baltic Provinces being either annexed by the Central Empires or formed into 'independent' States under German

hegemony. The growth of the Russian population, which Germany has regarded as a standing menace, would thus be neutralised, between twenty and thirty millions being transferred to the Germanic Powers. East Prussia, hitherto exposed to attack from south and east, would no longer fear invasion. The future of the frontier States—whether they should be annexed or granted independence under the ægis of Germany—would depend on the issue of the war, the military results of which would be exploited to the utmost.

But, when the German talks of defence, he is thinking of aggression; the only safe course being to take the enemy at a disadvantage and strike the first blow. From the point of view of the offensive, the proposed frontier would have certain advantages, which, though the matter is no longer of immediate importance, may be briefly indicated. Petrograd, being within 100 miles of the frontier, would be exposed to sudden attack on the outbreak of war. The extent of the combined frontiers of Germany and Austria would be reduced by 200 miles. The marshes of the Pripet, stretching from Brest Litovsk to the Dnieper, with an average breadth exceeding 100 miles, would divide the theatre of operations into two principal sections, and separate the Russian armies on the south from those on the north; while the Polish railway system would facilitate a German concentration in either section, and enable reserves to be readily transferred from one to the other. The southern section, 200 miles in length, would be the primary concern of the Austrians, whose flanks would be covered by the Dniester and the Pripet Marshes. The northern section, 450 miles in length, is shortened by Lakes Peipus and Pskoff, nearly 100 miles in length. Lastly, the Russians would have no favourable lines for defence, such as used to be afforded by the Vistula, the Narew, the Niemen, and the Bug—a matter of great importance to them on account of the time which would be occupied in mobilising and concentrating their armies.

On the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, the Germans, seeing their way to greater achievements, ceased to trouble about the 'secure frontier.' They seized the opportunity to do away with Russia once for all. The political theories of the Bolsheviks suited their purpose

well. While the Russian armies were in the field, and the Allies were pressing forward in the West, the Germans had little to say about the future of the occupied provinces. They waited on the fortune of war, relying on the efficiency of intrigue; and, when the Bolshevik theory of 'self-determination' promised to make them masters of the situation, they fell in with it readily. Russia being prepared to dismember herself, they were only too willing to support the suicidal policy. Such of the population of the occupied provinces as remained, after the exodus which took place during the advance of the German armies in 1915, were permitted to vote about their future under the military superintendence of Germany. A separate peace was concluded with the Ukraine Rada, at whose request German and Austrian troops were sent to repel the Bolshevik forces and to restore order. Columns occupied Minsk and marched on Petrograd, forcing the Lenin-Trotsky Government to accept peace on German terms. Later, German forces landed in Finland in support of Finnish independence. The dismemberment of Russia having been completed, the delimitation of the frontier and the status of the border states were no longer matters of concern. The effacement of Russia as a military power removed the menace on the eastern front; and, whatever the nominal status of the occupied provinces may be, they must ultimately fall under the domination of the Central Powers.

Let us consider how this altered state of things may be expected to affect the general situation after the war. So long as Germany and Austria stand united and remain great military Powers, they will be stronger than any possible combination of the remaining great Powers of Europe. The old balance of power will have been upset; and there is no apparent means by which a new balance can be established. At the outbreak of the present war the population of Germany and Austria was only two millions less than that of Great Britain, France, and Italy combined. In 1960, at the present rate of increase, the two Central Powers will have a preponderance of thirty-six millions (not counting the population of the occupied Russian provinces) over the other three Powers. Is it to be supposed that Russia will emerge

from the turmoil of revolution as a united military nation? How can her *dissecta membra* be recombined—unless, indeed, under German direction? The Revolution, which set itself to destroy existing leaders, has produced none to succeed them worthy of the name. Is it likely that less stirring times will be more prolific? The old autocracy allowed no scope for the development of the requisite qualities outside the governing classes and the army, both of which have been destroyed. The reconstruction of Russia as a unity, or even as a solid confederation, would be a slow process, which Germany may be expected to prevent, not necessarily by violent means, but rather by the Germanisation of the separate States, for which she is already making preparations by the customary method of commercial treaties and intrigue. When we recall the influence which Germany had acquired in foreign countries before the war, the experience which she has since gained, and the isolated condition of Russia, who can doubt the result? In the next war we may expect, at the best, to see the Russian States neutral, or, at the worst, to find them ranged on the side of Germany. We must face the fact that it will be, for the Central Powers, a war on one front, with comparative immunity from blockade, with adequate supplies at command, and with greatly superior forces at their command. And, if we were to look outside Europe for a force to aid in establishing a balance of power, could it be relied on to reach the scene of action in time to affect the decision?

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to refer to the terms of the treaty with Rumania providing for the transit of troops through Moldavia to Odessa, which, in conjunction with the cession to Turkey of the Russian districts of Batum, Ardahan, and Kars, opens a route to Persia and the East alternative to the Baghdad Railway; one which would be secure from any possible attack based on the sea, and which would need but slight addition to the existing railway system.

It seems evident from these considerations that the present war must decide the future of Europe. Nothing short of the decisive defeat of the Central Powers can prevent them from becoming predominant on the Continent; and, so far as one can see, the domination of Europe would ultimately lead to the domination of the

world. Germany and Austria united, being unassailable at home, could pursue their career of conquest, either by military means or by 'peaceful penetration,' as they pleased. Sea-power has proved to be no match for land-power with the huge armies of the present day. The problem of transport and supply by sea is too gigantic when operating at a distance from the home base. Railways, properly organised, will always beat ships. Germany established, say, in Northern Persia, or further afield, with a commercial railway system designed for military purposes, would be as unassailable as she would be at home. It is unnecessary to labour the point. These are axioms which must be kept in view when devising means for ensuring the future peace of the world.

The impracticability of reconstituting a balance of power by the old methods has given to the proposal for a League of Nations a significance which it did not possess when first mooted. In default of some better means for ensuring the maintenance of peace, it may indeed be said to hold the field. Even Germany, who aims at making herself the sole arbiter of peace, is disposed—so Count Hertling stated on a recent occasion—to consider the project; which at once arouses the suspicion that it is capable of being adapted to her own purposes. It will be well, therefore, to consider what it implies. Its object is to substitute Law for Force by means of compulsory arbitration and an international legislature; armaments being limited to the forces needed to preserve internal order, and to form, in combination, an international police. It can hardly be imagined that the proposed machinery would entirely prevent war. The principle of 'self-determination' is expected to lead to a situation so equitable that no nation will wish to disturb it; but, however equitable the settlement might be, on the ground of right and justice, it would be a bar to the ambitions of Germany, which would remain a constant menace to peace.

Apart from German aspirations, it is possible to imagine other causes of war. Congestion, resulting from the universal increase of population, is likely to give rise to burning questions in the future; and, in the changing circumstances which affect the human race, there will inevitably be causes of difference which a

virile people may decline to submit to the decision of a court composed of foreigners who might not be disinterested; or the decision might be such as to justify, in the opinion of one of the nations concerned, an appeal to force, which will remain, as it now is, the ultimate court of appeal. It is rarely that a conflict of interests affects only one nation; and we must, therefore, expect that, in the future, alliances will be formed, much as they have been in the past, for mutual support or for the pursuit of a common policy. The result may be war—a war, not between nations in arms, but between groups of the international police, in which the Powers most successful in intrigue (after the German fashion) would start with an advantage. Moreover, given a suitable organisation, the expansion of a group of international police into an army of formidable dimensions would not be a difficult matter, as may be judged from our own experience with no organisation at all to build upon. With the requisite framework secretly prepared in time of peace, the Germans might rely on getting the start and outpacing their opponents. To prevent such an evasion of the conditions regulating the size of armaments would be no easy matter, even under terms of peace dictated by the Allies. It might well necessitate a resort to force; in short, it might lead to war.

As an object-lesson in the uncertainty of alliances, this war has but illustrated the usual fate of coalitions. The Grand Alliance against Louis XIV was only just saved from disruption by the Peace of Utrecht. The coalition against Frederick the Great broke down, when victory was in its grasp, through the defection of Russia. One coalition after another, formed against the French Revolution or Napoleon, failed; and the last, which triumphed at Leipzig, would have ended in violent disruption at Vienna had not Napoleon reappeared. The Franco-British alliance against Russia was rapidly wearing out when the Peace of Paris brought the Crimean War to a close. The Balkan League against Turkey had no sooner beaten the Turk than its elements fell out among themselves. Thus a historian could hardly have expected that the Quadruple Entente would bear the strain of a prolonged struggle. It has not done so. The cause of its disruption was not, indeed, and could hardly

be, foreseen; and, if political reasoning could ever hold a coalition together, that of 1914—15 should have stood fast. The necessity for union was obvious. All the Allies should have realised, as plainly as anything can be realised, that they were fighting for existence against German domination. One might have thought that no bond could be stronger than the principle of self-preservation. Yet, at least in Russia, it has failed.

The Quadruple Alliance, on the other hand, has stood the strain of war; and what is, perhaps, more remarkable, the Powers composing it have recognised Germany as the predominant partner, surrendering to her the supreme control of operations. Unity of command, and the freedom of inter-communication conferred by continuity of territory, enhance the value of the military forces at its disposal. It may even, after the war, be a factor to be reckoned with in European politics, for, so far as can be seen, there is no prospect of its dissolution. The military decadence of Austria has been demonstrated by the inability of her armies to keep the field without the aid of German troops; and she is probably as convinced as she was after Königgrätz that her interests are bound up with those of her more powerful neighbour. The future of the 'Greater Bulgaria' depends on the supremacy of the Germanic Powers. It is the same with Turkey, who, though she has lost much by the war, has shown no disposition to cast off the German yoke, realising that only the triumph of Germany can restore her position in the Middle East. Thus what is now the Quadruple Alliance must be reckoned with as an influence which may endure after the war as a league within the League of Nations, with forces at its command which, grouped under the direction of Germany, would provide a formidable nucleus for expansion.

If these anticipations are well-founded, the primary object of a League of Nations would be to curb the aggressive tendencies of the Germanic group; and it would differ in no essential particular from the Triple Entente except that armies would be limited in size, and that the League would, nominally, embrace all the European nations. It is hard to imagine that the lesser Powers on the borders of Germany would not fall under her influence, and, at the least, hesitate to take part in

punitive operations against their great neighbour, if, indeed, they should not side with her. The experience of Serbia and Rumania in the present war is not calculated to encourage small States to incur the hostility of the Central Powers, in reliance on the support of other Powers more remote. In any case the strategical conditions would be more complex than in previous wars, as the plans for the employment of the international police would have to provide for every probable grouping of the Powers. Needless to say, the command of the police would be a thorny question, unity of control being even more difficult to attain than it is now. The limitation of standing armies would cause war again to become mobile; for their expansion during war would be gradual, and the newly-trained troops would appear only as successive reinforcements, entrenchments would be relegated to their old value, as mere adjuncts of the defence; and strategy would resume its former supremacy.

No fallacy could be more absurd, or more fraught with danger, than the assumption—accepted as axiomatic by the Inter-Allied Labour Conference in February—that the settlement of frontiers according to the principle of ‘self-determination,’ coupled with the establishment of a League of Nations, would eliminate strategical considerations from all international questions. The destruction of the enemy’s armed forces, which has proved impracticable in the case of the huge armies of the present day, would again become the primary object of military operations; and, with the small forces which would take the field at the outset, it is quite possible that an initial advantage might prove decisive. To make the frontiers between contiguous States conform to the racial boundaries would be to deliver one into the hands of the other. For example, as some Italian observers have pointed out, the inclusion of *Italia Irredenta*, without a further readjustment in places, would make the frontier of Italy even more disadvantageous than it was before the war. Weakness invites attack; and to minimise the risk of future wars it would be essential to ensure that no State, great or small, should be at the mercy of its neighbours. The question is a practical one, which cannot be decided offhand by Labour delegates or politicians in accordance with academic dogmas.

Such are the chief military problems which would have to be solved in connexion with the inauguration of a League of Nations; and there are others of a political nature which would tax the ingenuity of politicians and diplomatists. But, regarded as a whole, the problem may not be so impracticable as it appears from the purely military point of view. There are other means besides force, by which the League might assert its authority, chief among which is economic pressure, the power of which has been brought into notice by the war. An embargo on trade, which could be adjusted to various degrees of intensity, from a complete boycott to the prohibition of certain imports, would be a powerful deterrent. Such questions, however, lie beyond the scope of our subject; as do also various political delusions accepted in certain quarters, such as the view that democracies are not pugnacious, and that they will be scrupulous in the observance of treaties. It may, however, be remarked that these assertions are not borne out by the actions of such democratic organisations as Labour combinations, which have not hesitated to coerce non-unionists by force or the threat of force, and have shown little regard for agreements. Nor would it be wise to pin our faith to such phrases as the 'democratisation of Germany,' the 'triumph of internationalism' over patriotism, or the 'destruction of militarism.' The German people, although for three years they have suffered privations many times more severe than ours, appear, on the whole, to have been staunch, loyal, and patriotic; and their political and military systems have stood the stern test of war, and proved extraordinarily efficient. Had it been otherwise, Germany would long since have 'gone under,' and the Germans are well aware of the fact. Let us not allow ourselves to be deluded by specious catchwords and untried political theories, the truth of which is, to say the least, doubtful. Peace, if it is to be lasting, must rest on surer foundations.

W. P. BLOOD.

Art. 16.—GREECE AND THE BALKAN SETTLEMENT.

IN the October number of the 'Quarterly Review' appeared an article which advocated a 'Final Settlement of the Balkans,' 'imposed from above, and maintained under penalties, perhaps even *manu militari*, for a certain time.' To the friends of Greece and Serbia the very phrase 'settlement from above' is suspect, apart altogether from the terms of such a settlement. They remember that the only time the Balkan States have ever come to an amicable agreement was in the creation of the League of 1912, to which the Great Powers contributed nothing. The League was broken up by the impatience of Bulgaria, but Serbia and Greece effected a compromise that still forms the only solid basis for our hopes of a Balkan Confederation. Who would have thought, ten years ago, that Greece would acquiesce cheerfully in the loss of Monastir, the watchword of its Irredentism, the test case for the argument that town should weigh more than country in determining ethnology? The spirit of that compromise could not be more nobly set forth than in the speech that Venizelos delivered in the Boulé in March 1913:

'I have a conviction that the partition of the conquered territory will not be made by the military authorities, who have a limited horizon and look at matters from a merely military point of view, nor by the too fervid patriots of this State or that, but by these States' responsible Governments. . . . I hope their patriotism will be so lofty that they will not shrink from such sacrifices as will be inevitable if the partition is to ensure the continuance of the Alliance, even if they are bound to be called traitors by the fervid patriots of their own race.'

Venizelos was at the time speaking of concessions to Bulgaria. Twice in three years he has been willing to make her great concessions; first, at that time, to maintain the Balkan League, and secondly, in the first months of 1915, to recreate the League as an ally of the Entente. By those who cannot conceive of renunciation as a possibility of statecraft it has been argued that Venizelos then 'admitted the right' of Bulgaria to the Kavalla district west of the Strymon. Mr Alexander Pallis, of

Liverpool, who called Venizelos's attention to a statement of this kind in the English press, received the following telegram from him on Feb. 17 of this year :

'I am painfully surprised at the gross inexactitude of the writer's statement that in June 1915 both before and after the elections in a public speech I stated that Kavalla rightly belongs to Bulgaria. You are aware of the conditions under which in January 1915 I advised the ex-King to sacrifice Kavalla, in order to bring about the joint intervention of all the Balkan States on the side of the Entente, and the important concessions that I insisted upon obtaining in return. But never either before or after the elections of June 1915, either in public or in private, did I support the views I am accused of having supported; indeed, I could not possibly have done so, in face of the fact that before the Balkan wars Kavalla had a population of 13,000 Greeks, 12,000 Musulmans, and not one single Bulgarian, and that after the wars the Greek population had increased to 33,000, owing to the wholesale expulsion from Bulgaria of the Greek inhabitants of Western Thrace, when it fell into the hands of the Bulgars. It was the moderate attitude of the Greek Government, and its wider outlook upon European interest, that prompted me at one time to advise the sacrifice of a town entirely Greek in order to bring about a pan-Balkan intervention on the side of the Entente; and I am convinced that British public opinion will realise with what pain the people of Greece see that there are still in England such impenitent Bulgrophils who would claim from an Ally the cession of her own territory to one of Britain's enemies.'

The writer in the October 'Quarterly' exposes himself to the same criticism. In assigning to Bulgaria not only the district east of the Strymon, but a strip of territory along the northern frontier from Kilkis to Lake Prespa, he argues that his proposal 'does not differ materially' from that made by Venizelos in 1913, and that Venizelos 'said to the writer' that, though 'he could not give up Salonika,' 'he was ready to yield the other ports'? What grounds have the writer's proposals behind them other than these alleged 'admissions'? We need not pause over his argument that they 'show respect to recent European decisions,' when we find him immediately stating that the Treaty of Bucarest is 'of course defunct.' Why 'of course'? Why should the Treaty

of London and the Protocol of Petrograd have any superior moral validity? For no other reason that we can discover than that they gave advantages to Bulgaria which she lost by her own aggressive Prussianism in the second Balkan war. Her unselfish idealism in the Great War is apparently sufficient atonement to deserve reward.

No less suspect is the argument that 'British and other foreign trade' will be excluded from Macedonia unless its 'seaports are left in the hands of the State which controls the interior.' If we had any right to settle the Balkans from the point of view of British commercial interests—which we certainly have not—it might be answered that all that is needed for the purpose is a Balkan Customs Union. If we were to take into consideration British interests as a whole, strategical and political as well as commercial, we might add that, while it is true that the turn of events in the Ukraine may possibly make Bulgaria useful to us, there is no doubt whatever that the friendship of Greece, with her harbours and submarine bases, is of vital importance for the control of the Mediterranean. If we abandon Venizelos, we play into the hands of Constantine, who will naturally make the point that Germany guaranteed to Greece her ante-bellum frontiers as the price of neutrality, while we reward alliance with loss of territory.

Two further arguments of the Reviewer may next be considered—the positive argument that the needs of the back-country must be the main consideration in the allocation of seaports, and the negative one that the relative dimensions of the several States matter nothing. How far are they consistent with what is the chief justification for his proposals, that his 'frontiers are in the main identical with ethnical limits'?

For the Bulgarophil, ethnology is something to be used when it suits Bulgaria, to be brushed aside as irrelevant whenever it proves inconvenient. Practically the whole of the coast of the south-west of the Black Sea, of the Sea of Marmora, and of the Ægean is inhabited by Greeks. A seafaring, commercial people, they have been in possession of these towns and villages from time immemorial. In some of them there is a minority, mainly Turkish, slightly Bulgarian. Salonica is the one place where Greeks are less numerous than

other nationalities; and at Salonica it is Jews and Turks, not Bulgars, who take the lead. If Bulgaria is to have seaports at all, it must be in spite of ethnology. Yet in his desire to give each Balkan State a 'sufficient seaboard and an adequate number of ports,' the writer argues that there need be 'no serious infringement of the law of nationality, since most of the maritime towns are inhabited by mixed and more or less cosmopolitan populations.' It is no 'serious infringement of the principle of nationality,' for instance, to give Kavalla to Bulgaria, because (although there are no Bulgarians there) there is a minority of Turks side by side with a Greek majority, and the population can therefore be euphemistically described as 'mixed' without making it apparent that the Bulgarians do not form part of the 'mixture'! Similarly, the Reviewer makes no apology for including in Bulgaria the very large inland Greek population which extends in western Thrace to Demotika and Adrianople, or the Greek settlement in the very heart of Bulgaria at Melnik, or the other enclave at Strumnitza included by the Treaty of Bucarest in the new Bulgaria. On the other hand, when he is treating of the Macedonian Slavs who were left by the Treaty of Bucarest in the territory of Greece, the writer's ethnology is strict and admits of no exceptions. As a great concession, he suggests a possible loop around the Greek towns of Serres and Kastoria, in order to retain them in Greek territory; but not a village that is on either side of them must be sacrificed.

Now, it cannot be admitted that the Macedonian Slavs are all of them Bulgarians in sentiment. The rival propaganda of schools has meant that a certain number of Slavs by blood, as well as a large number of Vlachs and Albanians by blood, are Greek by sympathy, which is the chief matter that counts for nationality. This is a commonplace, in regard to Albanians and Vlachs, for those who have known the peasants in almost any district north of the Isthmus of Corinth. In regard to the Macedonian Slavs, evidence may be considered necessary. It can be found in the most unexpected quarter, in Dr Miletic's book on 'The Greek Atrocities in Macedonia during the Græco-Bulgarian War' (French edition, Sofia, 1913). The Slav peasants who give evidence

frequently use the word 'Bulgare grécisant.' Thus (p. 199), the father of a Bulgarian soldier named Haralambi Spassoff, and a baker named Haralambi Popoff (p. 120), are both thus called by the Bulgarian soldier who is giving evidence. He speaks also of a 'Valaque grécisant' who did not know Greek and spoke Bulgarian. Here we have a true Macedonian blend, where race, speech, and sympathy all differ. Another soldier (p. 128) tells of his being at Kavakli, three-quarters of an hour from the town of Serres. He and his friend thought that the peasants of this village were Bulgarians—'Nous nous sommes trompés; c'étaient des grécisants.' Yet Kavakli, we may be sure, would not be included in the Serres 'loop'!

Even, however, if we admit that the majority of Macedonian Slavs nourish Bulgarian sentiments, and that a large number of them were included by the Treaty of Bucarest in Greek Macedonia, it remains the fact that a vastly larger number of Greeks would have been included in Bulgaria, if she had not precipitated the Second Balkan War, and lost both the Adrianople and Kavalla districts. Although, by the Treaty of Bucarest, a number of these were given to Greece or left in Turkey, the excess of Greeks assigned to Bulgaria over Bulgarians assigned to Greece was still very considerable. No one suggests that it is possible in the Balkans to avoid some overlapping. Venizelos, indeed, in his famous memorandum of Jan. 24, 1915, to King Constantine, about the possible conditions on which he might be willing to cede Kavalla to Bulgaria, so far accepted this that he proposed an elaborate but rational scheme, advocating the solution that each country should exchange its nationals and buy out their property. All that we ask of our Bulgarophiles is that they should not ignore the difficulty in the one case, and stress it in the other.

It may be answered that, unfortunate though this inconsistency may be, it does not affect the Reviewer's main argument. This is that the Greeks, being merchants and sailors, can never populate the back country of Macedonia; and that the Bulgarians, who are naturally agriculturists, must (in defiance of equality of territory) be given all the back-country possible, and (in defiance of ethnology) enough seaboard to export their produce.

It is with this argument that we join issue. In the first place, it is most unlikely that, as the writer appears to think, the Turkish peasant will leave Macedonia *en masse*, now that he has experienced good Greek government. It is all very well for the Reviewer to dispose of the matter by airily remarking that 'The Turks by common consent must disappear from Europe.' It is the Turks, and not the Slavs, who are a factor in the agriculture of eastern Greek Macedonia. The latest official Greek figures for East Macedonia, excluding Thasos, taken for August 1915, before the Bulgarian invasion, are as follows :

Greek-speaking Greeks . . . . .	169,290
Non-Greek-speaking Greeks . . . . .	16,627
Slavs . . . . .	33,255
Jews . . . . .	4,400
Turks . . . . .	145,857
Total . . . . .	360,429

Without arguing the question of the 'Non-Greek speaking Greeks,' we may take it as indisputable that the Slavs are in an insignificant minority. The fact that thirteen Turks, and not a single Slav, were returned for Macedonia as a whole to the Greek Parliament of June 1915 is proof enough. It is extraordinary how Western writers ignore the Turkish element in the peasantry, which persists in spite of the overthrow of the Turkish government. The existence of these Turkish deputies, and of a Turkish mayor at Drama, shows incidentally that Greece is tolerant and fair. Nor, again, is it correct to say that Greeks cannot be agriculturists. The existence of the great currant-growing industry, the wonderful terrace work of islands like Andros and Tenos, the cornfields of Thessaly and Bœotia, are all witness to the contrary. In point of fact, the Greek is at his very best as a peasant; and what is the general opinion of travellers will be confirmed by archaeologists who have lived continuously with Greek country people during excavations.

We now reach the final point, the question of 'equilibrium.' It is argued in the 'Quarterly' article that the Balance of Power was brought forward hypocritically at the Treaty of Bucarest, and that there is no reason

why the various States should cover equal areas. Now, it may be that the principle of the Balance of Power has been exploited in the Balkans, as it has been exploited in Europe as a whole. It remains that in the Balkans, as in Europe, it is a sound principle when the problem that has to be faced is the attempt at hegemony by a single Power. It is in that spirit that Venizelos used it in his Memorandum of Jan. 24, 1915.

The problem before us, however, is not only or mainly that of checking the domination of Bulgaria; there is another equally important question which has to be solved as between Bulgaria and Greece. We have already alluded to Venizelos's suggestion as to exchange of nationals wherever there were 'pockets' of aliens, or where reasons of high policy made it impossible that frontiers should follow ethnological lines. Such exchange, however, to be successful, implies either that the populations to be exchanged are about equal, or that there is ample space for settling the excess number. The dominant fact about the Bulgarian and Greek races is that the latter is far more numerous than the former. Within the *ante-bellum* boundaries of the two kingdoms they are about equal, Bulgaria having a slightly larger total population of 5½ million (Utro, Nov. 25, 1918), but including in it more aliens. But Greeks outside Greece are vastly more numerous than Bulgarians outside Bulgaria. There are practically no Bulgarians in Turkey, Western Europe or America. The Bulgarophil Slavs of Serbian and Greek Macedonia added together could not, on the most generous estimate, be reckoned at more than a million. Greeks form a large element in the population of European and Asiatic Turkey, they are a compact majority in Cyprus, and they inhabit the whole of the Dodekanese. Further, there are considerable Greek colonies in the United States, Egypt and Western Europe. From the United States alone 57,000 men of military age went out to fight in the first Balkan War. It is a safe estimate to put the irredentist Greek population at from three to four millions. Some authorities put the total number of the Greek race as high as ten millions.

Now, we do not suggest that room must be found within the present boundaries of the kingdom of Greece

for the whole of this population. Cyprus and the Dodekanese should become Greek as they stand. Commerce and navigation will always attract a certain number of Greeks far afield. But, unless Turkey is driven from Constantinople, Thrace, and the coast of Asia Minor, there is no chance for Greece to increase its territory in that direction. The gross persecution that the Greek population has suffered at Turkish hands both before and during the present war will make it certain that the emigration from Turkey into Greece will be continued on a huge scale when peace is declared.

The 'Quarterly' Reviewer is rightly sceptical of Balkan statistics. Refugee figures, however, have a solid basis behind them when they are based on the actual numbers dependent on official relief or awarded grants of land. It is probable that, since the Treaty of Bucarest, nearly half a million Greeks have taken refuge within the frontiers of the kingdom. In June 1914 M. Naoum, the Greek Minister at Sofia, estimated the number as already 300,000. Some idea of the total number may be gathered from an official document drawn up in November 1915 for the Greek Government by a brilliant young Oxford man of Greek race, trained in British methods, who left the civil service of the Egyptian Government after the Balkan wars to work under Venizelos. It is a document not drawn up for propaganda purposes, but in order to record the numbers of refugees in receipt of Government aid in Greek Macedonia. Its total of 117,988 refugees does not include the considerable number who brought enough property with them to be self-supporting, nor the masses who reached Athens and other parts of old Greece, or escaped from Asia Minor to Chios and Lesbos, nor yet any who have emigrated since November 1915. Of the 117,988, 35,943 came from Bulgaria, 81,541 from Turkey.

The 'Quarterly' Reviewer adduces as an argument for giving Kilis (Kukush) to Bulgaria that before the Treaty of Bucarest 'some 7000' Bulgarophil Slavs occupied it. It may be deplorable that the change of population was effected, not by peaceful buying out of property, but by tumultuous 'following the flag' and rough-and-ready exchange of lands. It remains, however, that, if the 7000 Slavs left their farms at Kilis, 13,788 Greeks were

settled there by 1915, who had left their farms and shops at Strumnitza and Dedeagatch in Bulgaria. The 'Quarterly' Reviewer would on his proposed scheme hand over to Bulgaria 19,678 of these Greek refugees in the northern strip, and 39,595 in the Kavalla district east of the Strymon, as well as all the original Greek population of these districts.

To sum up, Bulgaria has no ethnological claim at all on the Kavalla district, and none on any part of Greek Macedonia which Greece has not in a much higher degree on large districts of Bulgaria. Secondly, Bulgaria has at present an area of 43,305 square miles for a race of about five million souls, Greece one of 41,933 for a race of at least eight million. There does not seem to be adequate ground for asking our friends to abandon their territory to our enemies, still less for 'imposing' such a settlement 'from above.'

RONALD M. BURROWS.

---

#### CORRIGENDA.

(1) By an unfortunate error in proof-correcting on p. 15, ll. 6-4 from foot, of the previous (January) number, the author of the article was made to say the opposite of what he intended. The passage should run thus: 'but both Mr Massey and Sir Joseph Ward reject,' etc.—(EDITOR).

(2) In the map illustrating Prof. Salvemini's article (in the same number) on 'Italy and the Southern Slavs,' Monte Maggiore should have been placed to the S.W. of Volosca (in Istria) instead of to the N.E. of Fiume.

(3) In the same article, p. 185, l. 13, for 'Eastern' read 'Western.'

## INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH VOLUME OF THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.*[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of  
articles are printed in italics.]*

## A.

**Abdul Hamid, Sultan of Turkey,** Pan-Islamic propaganda, 492—  
treatment of Arabs, 497.**Acton, John, 1st Baron, 'Corre-  
spondence,'** 205—student of history,  
*ib.*—career, 206—contrasted with  
Lord Morley, *ib.*—criticism of him,  
207—tribute from Lord Morley, 208  
—views on the Papacy, 209-212—  
test of political virtue, 212—judg-  
ment on Machiavelli, 213—literary  
style, 221.**Adolphus, John, 'History of England  
from 1760-1783,'** 369.**Aeronautics, Commercial,** 154—  
speed of an aeroplane, *ib.*—unvary-  
ing wing-area, 155—experiments  
in structural improvements, *ib.*—  
method of adjusting the planes,  
156—contraction and expansion of  
wing-areas, 157—aircraft of the  
future, 158, 161—advantages of  
using a number of planes, 160.**Afghanistan, result of the proclama-  
tion of the *Jehad*,** 507.**Ainger, A. C., 'Memories of Eton  
Sixty Years Ago,'** 293, 309, 317.**Allenby, General Sir E., in command  
of the troops in Palestine,** 285.**Anatolia, The Turkish Peasantry  
of,** 49—characteristics, 51, 60, 64—  
effect of a change of dynasty, 52—  
policy of Mahmud II, 53—system  
of government, 55—method of  
trade, 56—case of Sivas, 57—elimi-nation of the old territorial families,  
59—resemblance with the Irish  
character, 60—stories of Nasr-ed-  
din Hodja, 60-63—description of  
Akhmet, 63—deterioration under  
the reorganised administration, 64-  
67—system of bribery, 65-67—task  
of regeneration, 68—British and  
German influence, 68-71—adminis-  
tration of Cyprus, 70.**Andrews, John, 'History of the War  
with America, France, Spain and  
Holland,'** 369.**Army, British, military operations  
on the Western Front** 269-276,  
561-566—in Italy, 281, 283—Pales-  
tine, 285-287—Mesopotamia, 287.**Ashe, Thomas, 'Travels in America,'**  
360.**Austria-Hungary, military despotism,  
78 — military operations against  
Italy,** 276-285.

## B.

**Bailey, John, 'Keats and Sir Sidney  
Colvin,'** 459.**Balkan Settlement and Greece,**  
576. *See* Greece.**Barry, Dr, 'The World's Debate,'**  
235.**Belfast, the centre of revolutionary  
agitation,** 267.**Belgium and Luxemburg, 321—  
settlement of frontiers, 321-323—**

- the Duchy of Luxemburg, 321—revolution of 1830, 322—decisions of the Conference of London, 322 *et seq.*—separation from Luxemburg, 324–326—Duke of Nemours elected king, 326—M. Behr's dismissal from Berlin, 328—election of King Leopold, 330—cession of territory, 331–333.
- Benson, Dr A. C., 'Fasti Etonenses,' extract from, 300.
- Benson, Archbishop, on the English Church, 442.
- Bernhardi, General Von, on the alliance with Ireland, 252.
- Beust, Count, settlement of the Hungarian question, 240—criticism of the Home Rule Bill of 1886, 241.
- Birkbeck, Morris, 'Notes on America,' 362.
- Blood, Colonel W. P., 'The Course of the War,' 269, 559.
- Bosanquet, Bernard, 'The Distinction between Mind and the Objects,' 125, 140.
- Bradley, F. H., 'Appearance and Reality,' 126, 130.
- British Trade Corporation, 143. *See* Trade.
- British Writers on the United States, 357—relations between, *ib.*—J. Davis' 'Travels in the United States,' 359—other works on, 360–362, 369, 370—T. Moore's 'Odes and Epistles,' 360—Capt. B. Hall's 'Travels in North America,' 361—Mrs Trollope's 'Domestic Manners of Americans,' *ib.*—criticisms of the 'Edinburgh Review,' 363—views on slavery, 364—American views on the condition of the lower classes, 365—opinions of poets and men of letters, 366–368—War of Independence, 368—J. Adolphus' 'History of England from 1760–1783,' 369—'The American Oxonian,' 371.
- Brock, Clutton, handbook on 'Eton,' 313, 319.
- Brooke, Stopford, 526—biography, *ib.*—childhood, 527—characteristics, 527, 531, 533—preaching, 528—secession from the Church of England, *ib.*—harmonious career, 529—views on social evil and misery, *ib.*—work as a poet and critic, 530—personality, 531—power of intuition, 531, 533–537—uncompromising common sense, 532—generosity and sympathy, 533–535—period of old age, 538—essays, 539—style, 540.
- Bulgaria, concessions of territory to, 577.
- Burke, Edmund, definition of the term empire, 2
- Burrows, Ronald M., 'Greece and the Balkan Settlement,' 576.
- Byron, Lord, 'Ode on Venice,' 367.
- C.
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, Report of the Committee on Church and State, 439. *See* Church.
- Carpenter, Rt Rev. W. Boyd, 'National Churches and National Life,' 335.
- Casement, Sir R., contributions to 'Irish Freedom,' 246—seditious articles, 247–255—'Ireland, Germany and Freedom of the Seas,' 248—'The Keeper of the Seas,' 250—'Ireland, Germany and the Next War,' 252—traitorous dealings with Germany, 255.
- Cecil, Algernon, 'Two Distinguished Gladstonians,' 205.
- Chamberlain, J., character of his principles, 216—criticism on, 217.
- Child Education in India, 516. *See* India.
- China, result of the establishment of the Republic, 397.
- Chisol, Sir Valentine, 'Islam and the War,' 489.
- Christianity, The Indictment against, 27—result of the war, *ib.*—failure of Christianity, 28—religion of fear, 29—Hebrew Prophecy, 30—Greek philosophy, 31—character of the evolution of religion, *ib.*—Christianity as taught by its Founder, 32–36, 47—characteristics of the early Church, 35—the Catholic Church, 36–38—commercial competition, 38—the Puritan ideal, 39—internal anarchy in England, 40—war, a national industry of Germany, 41—main causes

of international conflicts, 42—war, a parasitic industry, 43—various classes of wars, 44—the 'human costs' of labour, *ib.*—the Christian standard of values, 45—condemnation of civilisation, 48.

Church Council, 453.

**Church Reform**, 439—Report of the Archbishop's Committee, *ib.*—relations between Church and State, 440—Catholic conception of the Church, 441—National Church, 442—attitude of Parliament, 443—Crown patronage and Court of Appeal, *ib.*—the 39 Articles, 444—the Prayer-book, 444–446—forms of Worship, 445—Discipline, 446—endowments, 447—main lines of the scheme, 448—Parochial Council, 448–453—Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences, 449—importance of the Parochial Council, 449—franchise, 450–452—test of confirmation, 450—functions, 452—the Church Council, 453–458.

Clayton, Bertram, 'Sinn Fein and Labour,' 256.

Cobbett, William, 'Year's Residence in the United States,' 365.

Coleman, Prof. C. B., 'Constantine the Great and Christianity,' 337, 338.

Coleridge, A. D., 'Eton in the Forties,' 299 *note*.

**Colvin, Sir Sidney**, 'John Keats,' 459—devotion to Landor and Keats, *ib.*—character of his critical study, 461—Preface, 462—on the influence of works of art on Keats's poetry, 463–465—The Sonnet 'Bright Star,' 466–468—object in writing the Life, 468—theory on 'Hyperion,' 470—analysis of his poems, 473.

Coolidge, A. C., 'Claimants to Constantinople,' 231.

Connolly, James, 'Labour in Ireland,' 258—'Labour in Irish History,' extract from, 261.

Council of the Empire, proposed formation, 22–25.

Creasy, Sir Edward, 'Historical Account of Eton College,' 299 *note*.

Cromer, Lord, on the influence of diplomacy on peace, 237.

Cust, Lionel, 'A History of Eton College,' 294.

Cyprus, character of the British administration, 70.

# D.

Dalmatia, the problem of, 191–199—population, 191.

Davis, John, 'Travels in the United States,' 359.

Dickinson, Mr., 'The European Anarchy,' 235.

Dillon, Dr., on the character of the Irish Republic,' 266.

Diocesan Conferences, 449.

**Diplomacy, Modern**, 222—charge against, *ib.*—attempt to democratise foreign policy, 223—Sir E. Satow's 'A Guide to Diplomatic Practice,' 224–226—C. Phillipson's 'Termination of War and Treaties of Peace,' 226—D. J. Hill's 'History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe,' 226–228—'The Diplomacy of the Age of Absolutism,' 228–230—Sir W. Phillimore's 'Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace and their Teaching,' 230—'Three Peace Congresses of the Nineteenth Century,' 231—A. C. Coolidge's 'Claimants to Constantinople,' *ib.*—first use of the word 'diplomacy,' 232—establishment of the system, *ib.*—nationality, the feature of mediæval England, 233—progress of the principle in other countries, 234—views of Dr Barry and Mr Dickinson, 235—various 'peace projects,' *ib.*—result of diplomacy, 237—view of Lord Cromer, *ib.*

Disraeli, Rt Hon. B., result of his foreign policy, 84.

Doyle, Sir A. Conan, 'Greal Britain and the Next War,' 253.

*Drinkwater, John*, 'Stopford Brooke,' 526.

Dublin, condition of the poor, 263, 267.

# E.

**Efficiency**, 110—imperviousness to reforms in Europe, 111—the two forces Efficiency and Prohibition in America, 112—F. W. Taylor, the

- founder of 'Scientific Management,' 113—series of experiments, *ib.*—methods at the Bethlehem Steel Company, 114—F. B. Gilbrette's experiments with brick-laying, 116—elimination of the wage question, 117—care of the individual, *ib.*—average wage of the members of the Typographical Union, 118—cost of strips of moulding made in England, *ib.*—need for scientific efficiency and daring change, 120.
- Egypt, effects of the war on the Mahomedans, 502.
- Eton: The Old and the New**, 293—works on, *ib.*—Public Schools in war and peace, 295—history, 296—299—the oppidan boarding houses, 298—treatment of the scholars, 299—the Masters, 300—religious teaching, 301—Government by Committee, 302—purchase of Agar's Plough, 304—increase of work under Dr Warre, 305—danger of destruction of individuality, 306—devotion to sport, 307—309, 319—moral and religious life of the school, 309—311—Chapel services, 310—separate rooms for the boys, 311—the Tutorial system, *ib.*—value of the tutor's reports, 312—position of the Headmaster, 313—training of the teachers, 314—social life, 315—custom of 'Shirking,' *ib.*—influence of the upper boys, 316—style of the building, 318.
- Evolution of Revolution**, 397—result in China, *ib.*—in Russia, 398—402—period of unrest, 402—unconsciousness of mankind to approaching social changes, 403—slavery, 404—serfdom, 405—result in France, 406—development of capitalist production in England, 407—the United States, 409—Germany, 410—reconstruction in France, 411—Cooperative Communism in Great Britain, 412.
- F.
- Fawkes, Alfred, 'The Genius of the English Church,' 440, 442.
- Fayle, C. Ernest, 'The Principles of Reconstruction,' 414.
- Fearon, H. B., 'Narrative,' 360.
- Figgis, John Neville, 'Selections from the Correspondence of the first Lord Acton,' edited by, 205, 221.
- Fiume, the problem of, 187—191—population, 187.
- Flogging natives, punishment of, 387—number of strokes, *ib.*—mode of administering, 388—deaths resulting from, 389.
- France, position of the Church, 345—downfall of the ancient nobility, 406—reconstruction in 1919, 412.
- France, system of Credit Societies, 152—military operations against Germany, 269—276—in Italy, 281, 283.
- G.
- Galton, Rev. Arthur, 'Church and State in France,' extract from, 354.
- George, Rt Hon. D. Lloyd, M.P., on unity of the British Empire, 2.
- Germany, war, a national industry, 41—military despotism, 78, 82—influence of methods of thought, 85—establishment of public kitchens, 162, 169—a soup menu, 166—hours of opening, 172—attitude of the people, 173.
- Germany and Sinn Fein**, 239. *See* Sinn Fein.
- Germany, military operations on the Western front, 269—276, 561—566—against Italy, 277—285—occupation of the islands of the Gulf of Riga, 288—armistice with Russia, *ib.*—moral of the troops, 291—result of the situation in Russia, 566—569—the Quadruple Alliance, 573.
- Germany treats the Native, How**, 372. *See* Native.
- Germany, administrative collectivism, 411—system of banking, 478—480—dependence on British capital, 486—support of the Pan-Islamic movement, 493.
- Gilbrette, Frank B., experiments on bricklaying, 116.
- Gladstonians, Two Distinguished**, 205. *See* Acton and Morley.

Glazebrook, M. G., 'Church Reform,' 439.

Godley, J. R., 'Letters from America,' 362.

Grahame-White, Claude, 'Commercial Aeronautics,' 154.

Great Britain, emancipation of serfdom, 405—development of capitalist production, 407—manufacturers and profiteers, 408—class-war between capital and labour, *ib.*—fall of Capitalism, 409—Cooperative Communism, 412—banking system before the war, 481—483—maritime commerce, 484.

Greece and the Balkan Settlement, 576—Venizelos' speech on the partition, *ib.*—concessions to Bulgaria, 577—Balkan Customs Union, 578—the Bulgarophil ethnology, *ib.*—the Macedonian Slavs, 579—number of Greeks in Macedonia, 581—Turkish element in the peasantry, *ib.*—question of 'equilibrium,' 582—exchange of nationals, *ib.*—total number of the Greek race, 582—584.

Green, J. R., 'Short History,' 370.

Griffith, Arthur, articles on the 'Resurrection of Hungary,' 239, 245—the creator of the policy Sinn Fein, 239. *See* Sinn Fein.

# H.

Haigh, E. Agnes R., 'Child Education in India,' 516.

Hall, Capt. Basil, 'Travels in North America,' 361.

Hall, Francis, 'Travels in Canada and the United States,' 362.

Hamilton, T., 'Men and Manners in America,' 361.

Harper, Harry, 'Commercial Aeronautics,' 154.

Headlam, Dr A. C., 'The Revenues of the Church of England,' 447.

Hill, W. J., 'History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe,' 225, 226—228—'The Diplomacy of the Age of Absolutism,' 228—230.

Hilton, John, 'Public Kitchens,' 162.

Holmes, Rev. Canon Scott, 'The Christian Church in Gaul,' 336, 345, 351.

Howorth, Sir Henry, 'Gregory the Great,' 'Augustine the Missionary' and 'The Golden Age of the English Church,' 336, 344.

Hungary, constitutional struggle against Austria, 240.

Hyndman, H. M., 'The Evolution of Revolution,' 397.

# I.

Idealism, the spirit of, 122 *et seq.*

Imperial Unity: The Practical Conditions, 1—I. *The Empire and its Components*, 1—5—II. *Allegiance and Sovereignty*, 5—12—supremacy of Parliament, 8—relations with the Dominions, 9—11—III. *Constructive Methods*, 12—18—plan of the 'Lyttelton Despatch,' 12—conversion of the War Cabinet into an Imperial Cabinet, 17—IV. *Parliament or Council?* 18—26.

India, effects of the war on the Mahomedans, 499—502.

India, Child Education in, 516—system of school and college education on English models, *ib.*—early training, 517—conditions of home-life, 518—influence of the ancient education, 519—result of the modern Western, *ib.*—need for universal primary education, 520—the rise of the spirit of nationality, 521, 524—influences of childhood, 521—a children's literature, 522—dormant civilisation, 523—province of women, 524.

Indictment against Christianity, 27. *See* Christianity.

Inge, Very Rev. W. R., Dean of St Paul's, 'The Indictment against Christianity,' 27.

Irving, Washington, 'The Sketch-book,' 357.

Islam and the War, 489—vital religion of Mahomedans, *ib.*—simplicity of the creed, 490—attitude towards the war, 491—influence of Germany, 492—494—Abdul Hamid, *ib.*—causes of the loyalty of the Mahomedans, 494—fatalism, 495—German methods

of frightfulness,' *ib.* — policy of 'Ottomanisation,' 496—Abdul Hamid's treatment of the Arabs, 497—the 'Young Turks,' 498—the Sherif of Mecca, *ib.*—the Mahomedans of India, 499–502—Egypt, 502—Tripoli, 503—Morocco, 504—Russia, *ib.*—Persia, 505—Afghanistan, 506–508—the Pan-Turanian movement, 508–515—derivation of the word, 509—linguistic basis, *ib.*—Turkey the spiritual and political leader, 510—Pan-Germanism the model, 511—'cultural' mission, *ib.*—result of the collapse of Russia, 512—conflict between Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turanianism, 513—the Nationalist movement, *ib.*

Istria, population, 182.

Italy, the liberation, 76, 78, 82.

**Italy and the Southern Slavs, 176**  
—The Question of the Southern Slavs, 176–180—The Problem of the Julian Veneto, 180–187—Fiume, 187–191—Dalmatia, 191–199—Territorial Compromise and National Guarantees, 199–203.

Italy, military operations against Austria, 276—Defeat of the 2nd Army, 278—retreat to the Piave, 280—number of prisoners, *ib. note*, 283—capture of Asiago, 282—San Marino occupied, 283.

## J.

Jacks, Lawrence Pearsall, 'The Life and Letters of Stopford Brooke,' 526.

James, Prof. W., 'Essays in Radical Empiricism,' 140.

Janson, C. W., 'The Stranger in America,' 360.

Japan, rapid transformation, 403.

Jones, Prof. Sir Henry, 'The Working Faith of the Social Reformer,' extract from, 129, 131, 132.

## K.

Kannenberg, Captain, atrocities in East Africa, 378.

**Keats and Sir Sidney Colvin, 459**  
—compared with Landor, *ib.*—objective visions, 460—character,

462, 476—'Endymion,' 463, 468—  
influence of works of art, 463–465  
—Sonnet 'Bright Star,' 466–468—  
instinct for language, 466—'Ode to Psyche,' 468—'Hyperion,' 470—  
473—inspiration, 471—admiration of Milton, 472—'Isabella' and the 'Eve of St Agnes,' 473—'Lamia,' *ib.*—Odes, 474—'Hymn to Pan,' 475—instinct for Romance *ib.*

Kenny, P. D., 'Economics for Irish men,' 259.

**Kitchens, Public, 162**—advantages of the system, 163, 175—demand for nutritious and economical ready-cooked meals, 164—means of attracting customers, 165—the self-contained and the central-kitchen system, *ib.*—provision of food 166—a soup menu, 167—variety of dishes, *ib.*—self-supporting, 168—method in Germany, 169, 172—objection to subsidising out of public funds, 170—difficulties of organisation, *ib.*—qualifications needed, 171—remuneration, *ib.*—hours of opening, 172—attitude of the German public, 173—number of participants, 174—argument against the principle, *ib.*

## L.

**Labour and Sinn Fein, 256. See Sinn Fein.**

**Labour, The Grievances and Aims of, 541.** 1. What are the chief grievances? 542–544—the aims, 543. 2. Working-class views on excess profits and profiteering, 544–548—food shortage, 547. 3. Why does Labour distrust the Government and its leaders? 548–550—influence of Syndicalism, 550—Socialism, 551—Pacifism, 552—attitude on the war, 554—influence of the Shop Stewards, 555—tendency to break away from Trade Unionism, 556–558.

**Labourer, A Skilled, 'The Grievances and Aims of Labour,' 541.**

**Landor, Walter Savage, compared with Keats, 459.**

**League of Nations, proposed, 571, 573–575.**

**Lecky, W. E. H., 'History of England in the Eighteenth Century,' 370.**

- Leigh, R. C. Austen, 'Etoniana,' 294.
- Leutwein, Gen. T., 'Elf Jahre Gouverneur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika,' 372.
- Lewin, Evans, 'How Germany treats the Native' 372.
- Linden, H. Vander, 'Belgium and Luxemburg,' 321.
- London, the financial centre of the world, 477, 481, 484—banking system, 481-483.
- Luxemburg and Belgium**, 321—separation from Belgium, 324-326—under Prussian dominion, 329—handed over to the German Confederation, 331—hatred of Prussian tyranny, 333.
- Luxmoore, H. E., 'Eton; The Old and the New,' 293.
- Lyte, Sir H. Maxwell, 'History of Eton College,' 294.
- Lyttelton, Alfred, influence at Eton, 316.

M.

- Macaulay, Lord, 'Essays,' 370.
- Macnutt, F. B., 'The Church in the Furnace,' edited by, 446.
- Marne, From Waterloo to the**, 73—P. Orsi's 'History of the World,' 73-75—national ignorance of the history of Europe, 75-77—from 1815 to 1870 .. 77-82—liberation of Italy, 78, 81—military despotism in Germany, 78, 82—Austria, 78—result of the anarchy in Russia, 79—of the Napoleonic wars, 80—abolition of slavery in the United States, 82—democratic character of the British Empire since 1870 .. 83—result of Disraeli's foreign policy, 84—the 'balance of power,' 85—worship of German methods, *ib.*—the Boer war, 87—the three great despotisms, 88—the age of revolution, 89.
- Marriott, J. A. R., 'Modern Diplomacy,' 222.
- Marryat, Capt., 'Diary in America,' 361.
- Martineau, Harriet, 'Society in America,' 362.

- Mazzini, Giuseppe, on the solution of the Dalmatian question, 194.
- Mecca, Sherif of, refuses to endorse the *Jehad*, 498—revolt against Turkish rule, 501.
- 'Memorandum of the Council of the Churchmen's Union,' 450, 452.
- Meredith, George, friendship with Lord Morley, 215.
- Miletich, Dr., 'The Greek Atrocities in Macedonia during the Græco-Bulgarian War,' 579.
- Montgomery-Campbell, M., 'How Germany treats the Native,' 372.
- Moore, G. E., 'Refutation of Idealism,' 133.
- Moore, Thomas, 'Odes and Epistles,' 360.
- Morley, John, Viscount, 'Recollections,' 205—student of history, *ib.*—career, 206—contrasted with Lord Acton, *ib.*—tribute to him, 208—views on Liberalism, 213—an 'inverted theologian,' 214—sketch of Oxford life, *ib.*—friendship with G. Meredith, 215—portraiture of J. Chamberlain, 216—Parnell, 217—the German Emperor, *ib.*—in India, 219—his championship of the Parliament Act, *ib.*—literary style, 221.
- Murry, John Middleton, 'Charles Péguy,' 91.

N.

- National Churches and National Life**, 335—policy to be adopted after the war, *ib.*—supreme position of religion, 336—works on, 336-338—influence of the Church on national development, 337, 343-345—characteristics of the Emperor Constantine, 338-340—result of his conversion, 340—development of national life, 341—missionary enterprise in Ireland, *ib.*—condemnation of the Church, 342—position of the Church in France, 345-354—study of Church history, 346—crude superstitions of the early Church, 347—story of St Fursey, 348-350—Vaticanism the enemy of true union, 351—relations between France and the Roman See, *ib.*—gift of organisation of Rome, 352—

protest of the Gallican bishops, 353—anti-national character of the Church, 354—Articles of 1682. *ib.*—national life in England, 355.

**Native, How Germany treats the,** 372—unpopularity of colonisation, 373—criticisms on the administration, 374—case of Dr K. Peters, 374–376—Herr Wehlan, 376—Herr Weist, 377—Lieut Dominik, *ib.*—Capt. Kannenberg, 378–380—Von Puttkamer, 380—the Akwa petition, 381–383—case of G. A. Schmidt, 383–385—punishment of flogging, 385–392—use of the sjambok, 387—brutality of the officials, 390—flogging of women and girls, 391—result of forced labour, 392–394—system of labour tickets, 394—the hut tax, *ib.*—curse of drink, 395—causes of the Herero rising, *ib.*

Nevill, Ralph, 'Floreat Etona,' extracts from, 301, 319.

## O.

Orsi, Pietro, 'Gli ultimi cento anni di Storia Universale,' 73–75.

## P.

Palgrave, Sir R. H. Inglis, 'The British Trade Corporation,' 143.

Parkinson, Richard, 'Tour in America,' 360.

Parliament, the British, its sovereignty, 8.

Parnell, C. S., characteristics, 217.

Parochial Councils, 448.

**Péguy, Charles,** 91—character of his death, 92, 108—parents, 93—childhood, *ib.*—Socialism, 94—marriage and failure of his bookshop, 95—'Jeanne d'Arc,' 95, 102, 103, 104—views on the case of Dreyfus, 96—opposition between *la mystique* and *la politique*, 96, 99—'Cahiers de la Quinzaine,' 97—essence of his thought, 99—fundamental and organic principle of his work, 100—a poet of humanity, 101—the Chaplain of the Republic, *ib.*—'Notre Jeunesse' and 'Victor-Marie, Comte Hugo,' 105—impression of his work, 107—poem of solemn prophecy, 109.

Perry, Prof. R. B., 'The New Realism,' 129, 132.

Persia, result of German diplomacy, 505.

Peters, Dr Karl, atrocities in East Africa, 374–376.

Phillimore, Sir Walter G. F., 'Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace and their Teaching,' 230.

Phillipson, Coleman, 'Termination of War and Treaties of Peace,' 225, 226.

Poley, A. P., 'The Privy Council and Problems of Closer Union of the Empire,' 17.

Pollock, Rt Hon. Sir Frederick, 'Imperial Unity: The Practical Conditions,' 1.

Prayer-book, need of revision, 444–446.

Puttkamer, Governor von, charges against, 380.

## R.

Rait, Robert S., 'British Writers on the United States,' 357.

Ramsay, Sir W. M., 'The Turkish Peasantry of Anatolia,' 49—'Impressions of Turkey,' extract from, 63.

**Realism, The New,** 121—incentive, 122—B. Russell's 'Problems of Philosophy,' *ib.*—'Philosophical Essays,' 123—the phenomenon of Realism a renewed sense of the need of fact, 124—common sense supplanted by Idealism, 125—the teaching of F. H. Bradley, 126—'What is the truth?' 127—questions raised by the New Realism, 129—Sir H. Jones' 'Working Faith of the Social Reformer,' 129–132—Prof. Perry's views on Idealism, 132—G. E. Moore's 'Refutation of Idealism,' 133—M. Sinclair's 'Defence of Idealism,' 133–135—doctrine of external relations, 136—Logic, the essence of philosophy, *ib.*—'things,' 'qualities' and 'relations,' 137–139—question of the existence of the 'self,' 139–141.

**Reconstruction, The Principles of,** 414—I. Primary Considerations, 414—Whitley Report, 414,

- 427—spread of democracy, 415—  
conception of the nation as a living  
organism, 417—views on the State,  
418—two types, 419—need for a  
quickening of the national spirit,  
420—principles of reform, *ib.*—re-  
action after the war, 421—shortage  
of food, *ib.*—centralised State con-  
trol, 422—Labour unrest, 423—  
pledges given to the Trade Unions,  
*ib.*—purpose and method of the  
various programmes, 424—advoc-  
ates of centralisation and regula-  
tion, 425—Scientific Industrialists,  
425, 434—Localists, 426, 437—State  
Socialism, 426, 433—Garton Memor-  
andum, 427—the term 'efficiency,'  
428—plea of 'necessity,' 429—result  
of a rigid uniform system of State  
control, 430—433—distrust of the  
doctrine of State Socialists, 433—  
technical education, 435—female  
labour, 436—Guild Socialists and  
Reintegrationists, *ib.*
- Revolution, The Evolution of,** 397.  
*See* Evolution.
- Richard, Brinsley, 'Seven Years at  
Eton,' 308.
- Roberts, Richard, 'The Church in  
the Commonwealth,' 440.
- Robinson, Rev. Canon C. H., 'The  
Conversion of Europe,' 337, 341.
- Rören, Herr, charges against G. A.  
Schmidt, 384—on the mode of  
administering flogging, 388, 390.
- Ruridecanal Conferences, 449.
- Russell, Bertrand, 'Problems of  
Philosophy,' extract from, 122, 139  
—'Our Knowledge of the External  
World,' 122 *note*, 137, 140—essay  
'The free man's worship,' 123—  
'Philosophical Essays,' extract  
from, 123, 124.
- Russia, result of disintegration of  
the army, 276, 289—Gulf of Riga  
islands, occupied by the Germans,  
288—armistice concluded, *ib.*
- Russia, result of the revolution, 398  
—population, 399—lack of capable  
administrators, 399 *note*—emanci-  
pation of the serfs, 400—weight of  
taxation, *ib.*—sale of agricultural  
produce, 401—issue of paper money,  
*ib.*—the peasants' demand for land,  
402.
- Russia, result of the secession, 559,  
566-569—influence of Germany,  
570.
- S.
- Sabatier, Paul, on the results of  
unscientific methods of teaching  
history, 344, 346.
- Salvemini, Prof. Gaetano*, 'Italy  
and the Southern Slavs,' 176.
- Samuel, Rt Hon. H., M.P., on the  
formation of a council of the  
Empire, 22.
- Satow, Sir E., 'A Guide to Diplo-  
matic Practice,' 225.
- St Fursey, legend, 348-350.
- Schmidt, G. A., atrocities in Togo-  
land, 383-385.
- Scholze, Herr J., 'Die Wahrheit  
über die Heidenmission,' extract  
from, 395.
- Scott, Prof. J. W.*, 'The New Real-  
ism,' 121.
- Seeley, Sir John, 'Expansion of  
England,' extract from, 343.
- Shall England Finance Germany  
after the War?** 477—London the  
financial centre of the world, 477,  
481, 484—banking system of Ger-  
many, 478-480—United States, 480  
—Great Britain, 481-483—com-  
mittee of bankers, 484—the Trade  
Banks 485—result of financing  
Germany, 486-488.
- Shelley, P. B., 'Revolt of Islam,'  
366—speculative tendencies of his  
art, 460.
- Sinclair, May, 'A Defence of Ideal-  
ism,' 133-135.
- Sinn Fein and Germany**, 239—A.  
Griffith's articles on the 'Resurrec-  
tion of Hungary,' *ib.*—the English  
Renunciation Act of 1782. 240—  
comparison between the position  
of Hungary and Ireland, 241—  
policy of passive resistance, 242—  
question of the Crown, 243—first  
convention of the Sinn Fein, *ib.*—  
adherents to the policy, 244—  
growth of the revolutionary doc-  
trines, 245—circulation of seditious  
newspapers, 245-247, 250—German  
intrigue, 246, 255—foreign policy,

247—the Sinn Fein Volunteer Movement, 248—Casement's review articles, 248, 250–255—dangerous character of the revolutionary movement, 250—extract from 'The Keeper of the Seas,' *ib.*—claim to be created an independent state after a victorious Germany, 251.  
 II Sinn Fein and Labour, 256—character of the revolution, 257—national class-consciousness, 258—relations between Capital and Labour, 259—factor of Socialism, *ib.*—racial and religious factors, 260—extract from 'Labour in Irish History,' 261—'union of the two democracies,' *ib.*—condition of the Dublin poor, 262—object of the Larkinite rising, 263—aim of the insurrectionists, 264—character of the future Republic, 266—condition of Belfast, 267.

Sjambok, use of the, 387, 392.

Slavs, The Southern, and Italy, 176. *See* Italy.

Smith, Robinson, 'Efficiency,' 110.

Smith, Sydney, on slavery in America, 364—affection for America, 367.

Smuts, General, on the result of the Boer War, 87.

Socialism, influence on Labour, 551.

Southey, Robert, Ode on the war of 1812–1814.. 366.

Stanhope, Lord, 'History of England from the Peace of Utrecht,' 370.

Stedman, Charles, 'History of the American War,' 369.

Sterry, Wasey, 'Annals of the King's College of our Lady of Eton beside Windsor,' 294, 296.

Syndicalism, influence on Labour, 551.

#### T.

Taylor, F. Winslow, experiments on scientific management, 113–115.

Thackeray, W. M., 'The Virginians,' 367.

Tommaseo, Niccolo, on the solution of the Dalmatian problem, 193.

Trade Corporation, The British, 143—connexion with the Government, 144—duties to home trade, *ib.*—to British enterprise overseas, 145—canal system, *ib.*—limited companies' shares, 146—number of extinct local industries, 147—capital, 148—Governor and members of the Board, *ib.*—establishment of Information Bureaux, 149—appointment of trade commissioners, 150—support of British industries, 151—foreign branches of banks, 152—method of raising funds, *ib.*—department for research work, 153.

Trade Unionism, tendency of Labour to break away, 556–558.

Trevelyan, G. M., 'From Waterloo to the Marne,' 73.

Trevelyan, Sir George, 'Early History of Charles James Fox,' 370.

Trieste, population, 181.

Trollope, Mrs., 'Domestic Manners of the Americans,' 361.

Trotha, General von, treatment of the Hereros, 373.

Tupper, Sir C. H., 'Treaty-making Powers of the Dominions,' 8 *note*.

Turkey, military operations in Palestine, 285–287—Mesopotamia, 287.

Turkey, policy of 'Ottomanisation,' 496—the 'Young Turks,' 498—Pan-Turanian movement, 508–515—the Nationalist, 513.

Turkish Peasantry of Anatolia, 49. *See* Anatolia.

#### U.

United States, abolition of slavery, 82—the force of 'Efficiency' or 'Scientific Management' and Prohibition, 112—history of the development, 113.

United States, British Writers on the, 357. *See* British.

United States, organisation of Capital, 409—the Trust system, 410—system of banking, 480.

Unity, Imperial, The Practical Conditions, 1. *See* Imperial.

V.

'*Vigilant*,' 'Sinn Fein and Germany,' 239.

Volosca, district, 182.

W.

Waldstein, Sir C., '*Aristodemocracy*,' 42.

**War, The Course of the**, 269, 559—military operations on the Western Front, 269-276, 561-566—in Italy, 276-285—Palestine, 285-287—Mesopotamia, 287—the Russian front, 288—failure of the Allies' programme, 289—establishment of an Inter-Allied War Council, 290—criticisms on the Allied policy, *ib.*—*moral* of the German troops, 291—result of

the secession of Russia, 559, 566-569—future of Europe, 570—proposal for a League of Nations, 571, 573-575—fate of coalitions, 572—the Quadruple Alliance, 573.

**War and Islam**, 489. *See* Islam.

War, attitude of Labour on the, 554.

War Council, Inter-Allied, established, 290.

Welby, Adlard, '*Visit to North America*,' 360.

Westcott, Rt Rev. B. F., '*Christian Aspects of Life*,' 441, 442.

Whittall, Sir J. W., '*Turkish Stories and Parables*,' extract from, 54, 60, 65.

Wordsworth, William, '*Ruth*,' 366.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH VOLUME.



